CHRISTIAN BAPTISM

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No. .....

SCB
10492

This Volume is

Presented to Dr S. Agnew, of

Philadelphia,

as an humble contribution to his

Collection of Books and Pamphlets

on the Subject of

Baptism,

by the Author,

John Wood.

Brantford,
Canada West,
Aug 3. 1858.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Calvin College

http://www.archive.org/details/manualofchristia00babc

A MANUAL

ON

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM:

ITS

MODE AND SUBJECTS;

BEING

THE SUBSTANCE OF SIX LECTURES DELIVERED IN THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH, BRANTFORD, C.W., DURING THE MONTHS OF SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER, 1856,

BY

THE REV. JOHN WOOD,
Pastor.

TORONTO:
MACLEAR, THOMAS & CO., PRINTERS,
16 KING STREET EAST.
1857.

PREFACE.

THE following lectures are printed at the request of the church of which the writer is pastor. They were not originally intended for publication, but were delivered to meet a peculiar local necessity. A most powerful religious revival, during the progress of which a large number of persons were hopefully converted to God, seemed likely to be suddenly arrested by an ill-timed discussion of the subject of baptism. The minds of the young converts were beginning to be disturbed, and the thoughts of the enquiring diverted from the great question of salvation to that of immersion. To avert the threatened evil, the writer publicly requested that during the progress of the revival all reference to this subject might be avoided, so that the work of God might proceed unimpeded. His request was misinterpreted, and taken as indicative of the weakness of his cause, and a consequent fear of discussion. Knowing such an impression to prevail he announced his intention of delivering a course of lectures on baptism at some future time; and, after a delay of nearly six months, he redeemed his pledge, and the reader has before him in substance the result.

It was impossible for the writer, amid the varied duties of a pastorate, to pay that attention to style and arrangement in the original composition of the lectures that he would like to have done. Some trifling alterations have, therefore, been found necessary in revising them, which it is hoped will add to the clearness and consecu-

tiveness of the argument; while some few things of a purely local interest have been altogether omitted.

It can hardly be expected that anything very *new* should be advanced upon a controversy of such long standing as is that on baptism, especially after so many men of learning and ability have directed their attention to it. The utmost the writer has hoped to do has been to state the arguments which have had most weight with himself, as simply as possible, and perhaps now and then to present an old thought in a new dress. Holding firmly and conscientiously the views he has endeavoured to set forth, his aim throughout has been to furnish the enquirer with a little manual on this subject, that being, in his view, much more likely to be useful, in a general way, than a work of far greater pretensions.

Brantford, May 1, 1857.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS: Undue importance often attached to the question.—The style of argument often indulged in.—Conscientious convictions of brethren often made the subject of ridicule.—False issues raised.

LECTURE II.

MODE OF BAPTISM: Analogy between the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and the baptism with water.—Greek prepositions.—The baptism of the Eunuch.—Discussion of Rom. vi. 4, "Buried with Him in baptism," &c.

LECTURE III.

MODE OF BAPTISM, *continued:* Meaning of "*baptizo.*"—Dr. Carson's position.—Quotations from the Classics.—The New Testament.—The Septuagint.—"*Bapto.*"—Quotations —Objections to which immersion is liable.—John's baptism.—Historical evidence on the mode.

LECTURE IV.

INFANT BAPTISM: Argument from the Abrahamic Covenant.—Household baptisms of the New Testament, involving infant baptism.—Historical evidence on infant baptism.

LECTURE V.

IMMERSION AS A TERM OF COMMUNION: The extent to which the practice is carried.—The argument for it.—Objections to it.

LECTURE VI.

REVIEW OF REV. THOS. L. DAVIDSON.

A MANUAL

OF

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM:

ITS MODE AND SUBJECTS.

LECTURE I.

1 Peter iii. 15: — "*Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear.*"

Acts xxii. 1:—"*Men, brethren, and fathers, hear ye my defence which I make now unto you.*"

The passages prefixed to this lecture must be regarded rather as mottoes than as texts, my intention being not so much to expound them, as to exhibit in them both precept and precedent for the course I am about to take. I am fully aware of the unpleasant attitude in which I place myself, by the announcement of a series of discourses upon the subject of baptism, especially towards those of my Christian brethren who conscientiously differ from me, many of whom I highly esteem. I doubt not that I shall be regarded by some as meddlesome and fond of controversy, "striving about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers." I trust, however, to be able to show in the course of these lectures that they mistake me, and that I have no such desire. Controversy, under almost any circumstances, especially among the people of God, can hardly be looked upon as anything better than a necessary evil. That it *sometimes* becomes a necessity scarcely any one will deny, and if in such circumstances we avoid it from its unpleasantness, we are as much to blame as when we rush uncalled into the strife. To me the present

seems such an occasion. Had I consulted my own inclinations I should have remained silent; but silence has ceased to be a virtue, and let that be my apology for speaking. The preaching of the cross is, to a right-minded minister, a much more pleasant employment than contending with brethren. The loving and prayerful spirit seldom dwells long with the controversial, and an undue regard to modes and observances uniformly injures, in just such proportion as it is cherished, the love of what is spiritual and vital. So is it also with the hearer. If the Son of Man be lifted up he will draw all men unto him; but if, in His stead, we elevate an ordinance, and fix the attention of the unregenerate upon the baptism with water, instead of the baptism of the Spirit, we may expect corresponding results. Surely if ever there was a time when Christians were called to sanctify the Lord God in their hearts, and make Him their glory, it is the present. The world is always prone to attach undue importance to the forms of religion; let the church beware of giving it the example!

Moreover, the disciples of Christ are all really "one," and it were well if they were more closely united in their outward organisations. It is hence extremely undesirable to make prominent before the malignant eye of the world the *dissensions* instead of the *unity* of the church. Controversy necessarily does this, even under the most favourable aspect, and is therefore, so far, an evil.

For all these reasons I was very reluctant to do anything that could be construed into a love of debate and contention; and it is only because I think the time has come to speak, after long refraining, that I have announced these lectures.

Before entering upon the discussion of the question at issue, I have thought it better to devote one evening to some preliminary remarks on matters connected with the controversy, but much better dealt with in this separate form. The reason assigned for my course,* while it is the main one, is by no means the only one. There are some things which our Baptist friends need to know concerning themselves and their polemics, that, for want of better means of communicating, I shall endeavour plainly, yet I hope kindly, to tell them. We seldom see ourselves as others see us; we are usually so self-complacent and indisposed to look at our own faults and peculiarities, that but for their being pointed out to us by others we should never know them. To a certain extent we are to bear with one

---

* See Preface.

another in these things; but when the cause of pure and undefiled religion is suffering from them, one fulfils only the part of a friend, and the obligation of a Christian, in pointing them out. And it is because of the damage which the things I am about to mention are doing to the cause of God, that I speak of them. I have no right to occupy the columns of their religious newspaper; and but little that I could say through the columns of our own would reach them. I take, therefore, the present opportunity of giving expression to not my own views merely, but those, I doubt not, of very many of my Christian brethren of various denominations. I may be thought officious and assuming for my censure; the beam in my own eye may be pointed out; and if in judging another I be condemning myself, I hope it *will* be pointed out in the spirit of meekness, for "open rebuke is better than secret love." But, on the other hand, if I incur the displeasure of a party, I shall at least have the satisfaction of knowing that I have *aimed* at the furtherance of the Gospel. I beg therefore to say, once for all, that I shall speak very *plainly*, often perhaps *warmly*, but I hope never unkindly or untruthfully.

I. My first preliminary remark is, that our friends of the Baptist denomination attach undue importance, and give undue prominence, to the whole question involved in this discussion. Upon this point alone do they differ from their Congregational brethren. We are one in doctrine and church polity, and were they dispassionate enough to allow us quietly to enjoy our conscientious convictions, we might still be one in organisation. *We* can bear and forbear, if *they* can. We receive Baptist brethren to our fellowship, and have them in it now; but the act is not reciprocated. The consequence, of course, is separation, and separation is, under the circumstances, the lesser evil of the two; for schism *without* the church is much better than schism *within* it. And this state of things must continue until the zeal of the Baptist body for immersion, and anti-pædobaptism, and close communion, shall become somewhat more temperate than at present.

"But," say our friends, "we are put in charge of the truth; we alone are baptized; and Christ has commissioned us to go into all the world, preaching the Gospel, and baptising men into his name." Admitting, for arguments sake, that this is so, should the *mode* of baptism be made their leading peculiarity? And is not this the case with them at present? Is not immersion inscribed on their

banner? Does not every one, on hearing their name, think of that as their chief distinction? Our Baptist friends surely cannot say, "We are of Paul;" for Paul says, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel," (1 Cor. i. 17.): neither can they say, in this respect, "We are of Christ;" for "Jesus himself baptized not." (John iv. 2.) Many of them, we rejoice to know, are estimable and devoted brethren, but, in common with not a few others, I cannot help regarding the body, as a whole, as "the straitest sect of our religion." When charging us, therefore, as is not uncommon, with adopting the trumperies of Rome in the practice of infant baptism, it were well for them to beware of the bigotry and exclusiveness which are the very core of Romanism. The name, *Baptist*—implying that no other section of the Church of Christ *baptizes*—is an unwarrantable assumption; especially, since *Immersers* or *Anti-pædo-baptists** would suggest much more readily their peculiarities of doctrine and practice.

As Pædo-baptists we have probably erred in the opposite direction. Our comparative silence has undoubtedly often been taken as an indication that we are not very sure of the ground we tread on. And truly, if declamation is to be taken for argument, and the frequency with which our opponents introduce the subject, as evidence that they have so much more to say than we have, we acknowledge ourselves at once *hors de combat*. The confident, however, can afford to be calmer, and say less than the mistrustful; and we can assure our Baptist friends, that we regard their constant preaching upon this subject as expressive of anything but calm conviction, and enlightened decision. May it not indicate the very opposite?

I have spoken of the comparative silence of Pædo-baptist ministers upon this question, but, in the case of many, the silence has been *total*. They have allowed the good old English Bible, in the homes and hearts of their people, to form their people's views, simply adding, on their part, the impressive comment of an occasional public baptism. For about eleven years I enjoyed the ministry of the Rev. Dr. W——, of M———, yet I cannot recall the fact of his preaching a single discourse upon the subject of Baptism—at least, as to its *mode*—during that period. I know of a neighbouring minister, also, who was compelled to lecture upon the subject, under circumstances somewhat similar to my own, and who was afterwards told by his people, that

* Rejectors of Infant Baptism.

his silence in relation to it had led them to think he could have very little to say in defence of his views. That brother had not preached upon it during a ministry of seven years in the same place—not once! The same remark applies to myself;—for nearly four years have I been entrusted with my present charge, and never once have I preached upon the mode of baptism, although on five different occasions I have administered the ordinance to adults, on the profession of their faith. I have on several occasions endeavoured to show the divine authority we possess for the practice of infant baptism, but never have I uttered a word publicly in defence of our *mode*. Will our Baptist friends tell us how many discourses they have heard on immersion, during the same period?

The effect of this silence has been, either, as I have said, to create the surmise that we have very little to say in defence of our views; or else, from the very rarity of the event, to lay us open to the charge of *attacking* our brethren who differ from us, when we venture to break our long silence on the subject. On *both* horns of this unpleasant dilemma have I been placed by turns; for although my discourses on infant baptism have invariably been announced a week beforehand, so that no one might be compelled to listen to what they did not wish to hear, (and a Baptist, on such occasions, is always a *rara avis*,) yet in almost every instance have I been charged with *attacking* my brethren. Hitherto, however, I have simply stood on the defensive, avoiding, as far as possible, all reference to those who differ from us, and confining myself, in the discussion of the subject, to baptismal services. The ground of complaint is, therefore, all on our side, and we *do* complain of the frequency with which it is introduced into their pulpits, and more still of their manner of presenting it. But we must not anticipate.

The undue importance attached to this question by our Baptist brethren is exhibited in many ways, however, besides the one just indicated. The zeal of the pulpit enkindles the zeal of the pew, and, indeed, is often fairly outstripped by it. What the latter lacks in piety and prudence is often more than supplied by its boldness and volubility. "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." The popular taste forms the popular literature. The press echoes the sentiments of the party that sustains it, and allots to the favourite topic the prominence and space which it seems to demand. Tracts, and pamphlets, and minor publications without number, are put in requi-

sition, and distributed often with a freer hand than the word of life itself. And these attempts at proselytizing are by no means confined to those in whose case the great question has been settled: the impenitent, and even the enquiring, whose anxious gaze should be fixed on the dying Redeemer alone, are often harrassed, and, we fear, sometimes ruined, by this immoderate zeal. Indeed, the solemn scenes of a revival season appear to be selected, not unfrequently, as its most appropriate sphere. This is not only undeniable, but it is publicly defended; and so common has it become, that I expected it during the gracious revival of last winter. In *three* instances of remarkable and extensive awakening have I known it to occur. The mind of the young convert is so open to instruction, and his heart so tender, that any one may take advantage of it, and the golden moment is seldom allowed to pass unimproved. Would that the same amount of effort were embarked in a better cause! Would that the record of revivals *killed out* by means of this nature, had taught our friends to defer the agitation of this question till the great work is done! We rejoice in the conviction that the firm stand which was recently taken against controversy at such a time, was made, in answer to prayer, the means of protracting the season of religious interest far beyond its probable continuance, had not the "old leaven" been purged out in time. There are some, we believe, now in the fold of the Good Shepherd in consequence of it, who would otherwise have been only more opinionated on the mode of baptism. And such a result is of a thousandfold more moment than one's reputation as a polemic.

I am not sure but this zeal has increased in ardency, of late years. If I may rely on the testimony which I have received on this point, the ministers of the last generation said less about immersion, and the churches thought less about it, as a term of communion. However this may be, it must be regarded by all but themselves as excessive at present. They are, of course, at liberty to seek the spread of their conscientious convictions—nay, more, they are bound to contend for the truth as they understand it. But denominational zeal must have certain limits—limits which I regard our Baptist brethren as having transgressed through the over-estimate they have formed of the importance of the mode in which their favourite ordinance is to be administered. It is this that has placed them in the false position which they occupy in the eyes of the Christian public, many of whom regard them as making immer-

sion a saving ordinance, as well as a term of communion, notwithstanding all their protestations to the contrary. I rejoice in the conviction that their ministers, as a body, present no other Saviour than the Lord Jesus Christ, and that they utterly repudiate the idea of a salvation through baptism. And yet, by a nice distinction—too nice by far for ordinary hearers,—some of them seem not very sure of the safety of the unbaptized, their fears arising, apparently, from our disobedience to a command so plainly revealed as that which requires us to be immersed! The result is very great *danger*, to say the least, of the less informed of their congregations thinking immersion essential to salvation. How can they avoid such a conclusion, when they hear quoted in almost every sermon on baptism, "he that believeth and is *baptized*, shall be saved," with the emphasis on "baptized?" I have reason to know, moreover, that while, in common with other religious bodies, the Baptists regard adult baptism as involving a profession of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, cases frequently occur, in which parties are urged and hurried into immersion, as if that were the one thing needful. Two persons in my congregation, and one, a member of another Christian church in the town, are my witnesses in this indictment. One of them, a lady, was immersed when a girl of thirteen years of age, by a minister in England, who never asked her any question whatever. Another, quite a lad at the time, was immersed, after much persuasion, in K——, C. W., contrary to his own convictions, which were so strong that he could not be induced to sit down at the Lord's table; and alas! subsequent life has shown his unfitness. The third, after much importunity, was at last persuaded to "take up the cross," the motive urged being that he would thus obtain peace of mind. I ask again, what impression are these things likely to produce? Is there no danger in assuring a congregation that immersion will confer "a salvation from *doubt*," as was recently done, of some poor, unlettered hearer being misled? Is this giving the trumpet a certain sound? Shall we joke, or indulge in fanciful allusions, when the plainest statement of the way of life is often misunderstood?

II. My second preliminary remark is, that our Baptist brethren often adopt a style of argument upon this subject, that is neither kind nor convincing. The questions of the proper mode and subjects of baptism, are not questions for trifling, or banter, or dogmatism. They involve issues of

considerable moment. The wise and good of many an age have differed, and differed conscientiously, upon them, and therefore assertion and assumption are altogether out of place here. Other things being equal, the opinion of one man is as good, and entitled to as much weight, as that of another. Its value depends entirely upon the intelligence and candour of the individual who offers it. Any attempt, therefore, to settle the question by the aggregate weight of human opinion must inevitably fail, since it would be vastly more difficult to determine its value than to settle the original question. Let all mere assertion, therefore, on either side, go for just what it is worth. I ask no one to take my assertion for anything, neither will I accept of his. No honest man has any use for it, any more than for counterfeit coin. It has a suspicious look to find it in a man's possession; there is great danger of his using it in place of legal tender, or, in other words, of argument.

Still less convincing are the hard words—the charges of ignorance, and want of conscientiousness and candour, with which we are sometimes met. If we are to have discussion, let us have "soft words and hard arguments." I am not now fighting a man of straw; I am censuring a practice by no means uncommon, and one that is very apt to provoke unkind replies, and lead to altercation and personalities. One might endure even the charge of ignorance, for my ignorance may arise from the want of the powers of perception and induction necessary to comprehend an argument, and may, therefore, be more my misfortune than my fault; but for a want of candour I am responsible—*that* is a *crime*. It is painful to hear such a man as the late Dr. Cox, of Hackney, one of the most eminent writers on the Baptist side of the controversy, expressing himself concerning those who differ from him, in the following language:—"Their churches contain vast numbers of theoretic Baptists, who have discernment enough to appreciate the force of evidence, but *not piety enough to pursue the path of duty;*" *i. e.* they shrink from immersion. Such a sentence fully vindicates all I have said about assertion, and charges of a want of candour.

The very same charge has been made to me personally, and doubtless with a personal reference. An intelligent christian lady hazarded the opinion that if we could only be freed from our prejudices for one month, and induced calmly to weigh the evidence in favour of immersion, and believers' baptism, we *must* be convinced of the correctness of their views; adding, however, that she believed that

many were convinced, but were deterred from changing their relations by the thought of having to be immersed.

Reply to charges of this kind would be useless. The parties who judge our consciences thus will surely depend but little on our truthfulness, and it would be the sheerest folly, therefore, to lay claim, as we might do, to as thorough conscientiousness as they possess. Still, I must be allowed to say, that if I am not a Baptist, it is neither from want of careful study, nor I trust from want of candour, nor, finally, from want of effort on the part of well-meaning friends in Brantford. Several unsuccessful attempts have been made to convert me since my residence among you, by tracts sent anonymously, or inserted under my hall door, on the subject under discussion ; one of them accompanied with the unexceptionable advice, written upon it in almost illegible characters, "*read this with prayer.*" Not the least amusing part of this last named effort was that the tract was one of two pages, in which it was deemed such an irrefragable argument had been adduced as to be worthy of such an honourable mission as an attempt to convert a Pædo-baptist minister !

I am sorry to say that the style of argument of which I complain abounds in the writings of our Baptist brethren, as well as in their public discourses. They are extremely impatient of contradiction, and often seem to speak with the air of infallibility. Thus, for instance, Campbell attributes our views to "prejudice, bigotry, and interest," and disposes of our arguments as "boyisms, crudities, puerilities, mere trifling, and things beneath notice." Carson, however, to whose work I shall frequently have occasion to refer in the course of these lectures, must be admitted to have borne off the palm for this kind of logic. Under his masterly hand the ablest arguments of Wardlaw, Ewing, and Beecher, become "mere trifling," "nonsense," "childish fallacy," "extravagantly idle," "perverse cavilling," "sickening," "false, fanatical, and subversive of all revealed truth," "heresy," and "blasphemy," while their authors are found guilty of "calling the Holy Ghost a liar." I have seldom met with an instance in which the *style* of a book has been so calculated to defeat the *object* for which it was written. No more striking contrast can be conceived than is presented between the style of Dr. Carson, and that of his opponents, and indeed of Pædo-baptist writers generally. "If our brethren will only use kind and gentle words—there are plenty of them—and thus express a catholic and loving spirit, they are welcome to use the strongest argu-

ments they can find, and we will give them all the consideration to which they are entitled."

III. My third remark is, that the conscientious convictions of Christian brethren should be so respected as never to be made the subject of *ridicule*, however much we may differ from them. To sin against a brother is to sin against Christ, and in no way can you so deeply wound an humble believer as by speaking lightly of an ordinance which he regards as solemnly enjoined upon him by the Lord he loves. Should any, therefore, regard it as demonstrated that the baptism of the infant children of the Lord's people is wholly unwarranted by His Word, they would still be bound to respect the views of others who do not so regard it. How much more so, when the unscripturalness has *not* been demonstrated, and seems very unlikely to be! Yet our Baptist brethren are very apt to be merry at the sight of "a sprinkling," or a "baby baptism," especially if the baby should *cry*. On one occasion a very attentive observer reported the number of drops of water that fell from my hand upon the head of a lady whom I was baptizing on profession of her faith. A most convincing argument in favour of immersion has doubtless been the result! I am sorry he should have seen nothing but the water in so solemn a service.

Not long since the Pædo-baptists of Brantford were publicly invited, on the Sabbath day, to prove from the New Testament that the moon is made of green cheese before they attempt to show any warrant in it for infant baptism. I am fairly ashamed to quote such a remark, but if it be too gross to repeat, it was certainly unseemly to make use of it. On at least two occasions have we been told that we have precisely the same authority in the New Testament to administer baptism to an infant, that a certain infidel club in New York had, when, in their rampant impiety, they baptized a dog, and administered the Holy Supper to a cat, viz., that it is not specifically forbidden! How can we characterize such an illustration but as indecent, and even profane? Why should such offensive associations be thrown around what the great mass of professing Christians regard as a Divine and most precious ordinance?

If our Baptist brethren would study the advancement of their own cause, they will make less use of this weapon than they have done. Intelligent hearers are very apt to turn away in disgust from such a mode of treating the subject. Apart from the sin of such a course, its legitimate

fruits are anything but desirable. A man won over by ridicule will be found wanting either in intelligence or in candour; one convinced, whose judgment has been in exercise instead of his risible faculties, will be worth a dozen of him. The fact of a child crying while water is poured upon its face, however ludicrously represented, never yet convinced any one of the errors of Pædo-baptism. The infant screamed far more under the knife of circumcision. I must be pardoned, therefore, if I repeat what has so often been remarked before, that the fears and tears of a child are quite as natural in its circumstances, as the gasping and agitation of an adult suffering immersion are in his. Neither the one nor the other forms any part of the ordinance.

One cannot but be struck with the kindly manner in which our Saviour invariably spoke of little children. He calls them "little ones," "lambs," and such like, and "takes them up in his arms, and blesses them." Our Baptist friends certainly cannot copy a higher example, and I would therefore respectfully suggest that the somewhat contemptuous epithets in use among them, to which I have already referred, be in future dispensed with. They surely must know that there is much more connected with an immersion that is calculated to excite a smile than there is in the baptism of an infant. Ridicule is a sword with two edges, which might be turned with fearful effect against their own favourite mode. The crowd of giddy young people, who usually flock to every immersion, care much less about the devotional parts of the service, or the sermon, than they do about the dipping of one or more persons into the water, with its invariable accompaniments. They go to *see*, not to hear. They want a good seat, near the baptistery, commanding a full view of the sight of the evening. A back seat would be a cruel disappointment. Hence the restlessness often manifested till the preparations for the immersion begin, and then every one is attentive, every head is bent forward, every eye strained to see. And is it the solemn dedication of a soul to God that forms the attraction on the occasion? I trow not. Who will believe that such an audience as is sometimes gathered at a baptismal service, could be got together to listen to an ordinary discourse? No! without the immersion the sermon would be very stale, and hence the universal practice of presenting the Baptist side of the question on such occasions, thereby compelling those to *hear* who come to *see*.

Whether it be right to throw these fictitious attractions

around the service of the sanctuary, and pander to what I cannot help regarding as a corrupt taste, in some instances bordering on the immoral, is not for me to decide. "It is written, my house shall be called the house of prayer," and certainly the more nearly we copy the Divine original the better. "Let all things be done unto edifying."

The blame, however, does not belong wholly to our Baptist brethren. Our own people are at fault. Some of them have eyes that are "never satisfied with seeing." Their own sanctuary—their religious home—is too readily left for another, on a very trifling inducement. Oh! that they desired more "the sincere milk of the word that they may grow thereby." The hungering and thirsting soul will not be satisfied with exhibitions of the nature referred to. It must have food, and will be content to look for it where it has usually found it. "As a bird that wandereth from her nest, so is a man that wandereth from his place." Were our Baptist friends left more to themselves on such occasions they would soon find discoursing on immersion an unprofitable business, and would let it alone. But finding so many always ready to see, they, of course, improve the opportunity to the utmost, and hence the evil is perpetuated. I would earnestly recommend any who may be in doubt upon this subject, to sit down calmly to the investigation *at home*, with the Book of God in their hand, together with any helps to understanding it which may be within their reach, and "ask of God." Such a course is much to be preferred to wasting the precious hours of Sabbath worship in listening to so unspiritual a theme, and much more likely to lead to a correct conclusion.

IV. My last remark is, that great injury is often done to the cause of truth, in this controversy, by *raising false issues*. The real point in dispute is not unfrequently altogether lost sight of in a laboured argument, in proof of what no one disputes for a moment. Probably, most persons have heard discourses, elaborate and conclusive enough so far as they go, in defence of the position, that the Greek verb *baptizo* signifies to immerse; and many have gone away thinking that Pædo-baptists must be either strangely blind, or sadly perverse, in continuing to practise any other mode. But you will mark that our Baptist friends have to prove much more than that, before their mode is established. That is not a question at all. Everybody admits that *baptizo* signifies to immerse, plunge, sink—*sometimes!* I will admit that it does so very frequently. But now come two other questions.

1. Does it ever signify *anything else?* Is it ever used in the classics in the sense of, to dip partially, to cover by overwhelming, rushing, or pouring; to wet or soak, without any reference to the manner in which it is done? If it be, as I believe it is, the corner-stone of the Baptist theory is gone, however numerous their quotations. I hope to establish this point in the course of these Lectures.

2. If it could be proved invariably to have signified to immerse, in its use in the classics, is it certain that it retains that signification in the New Testament? Many words originally found only in the classics, receive, on their introduction into the New Testament, an entirely different meaning. Thus, *ecclesia*, used in one of its original senses, in Acts xix. 41, of a disorderly assembly, receives usually the special signification of church, an assembly of christians,—one entirely new. So, *eulogeo*, in the classics, signifies to speak well of: in the New Testament, to bless. Other examples might be named; but let these suffice. I shall be able to show, I think, a similar change in the use of *baptizo*. I am willing, however, to rest the argument on the first of these questions, and have no hesitation in saying that, upon the presentation of *clear proof* that *baptizo* and *bapto*, its cognate, in every instance meant to plunge under water, or any other element, I will both submit to, and practise, immersion.

Our Baptist brethren are generally guilty of asimilar sophism, when contending for adult or believers' baptism. They ought to know that they have more to do than prove the scripturalness of adult baptism, in order to disprove the Divine authoity of infant baptism. There is nothing in the practice of the one, antagonistic to the practice of the other. As well, therefore, might a Unitarian hope to disprove the Deity of Christ by proving his humanity. Any one may see the fallacy, that reflects upon it but a moment. The point in dispute is not whether believers *or* their children are to be baptized, but whether believers *and* their children are to be baptized? I shall endeavour to keep these several points distinctly before you when the proper time shall arrive to discuss them. May the Divine Spirit assist us in our investigation, and guide us into the truth!

LECTURE II.

THE MODE OF BAPTISM.

LUKE iii. 16:—"*John answered, saying unto them all, I indeed baptize you with water; but one mightier than I cometh, * * * * he shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.*"

ACTS xi. 15, 16:—"*And as I began to speak the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.*"

THE disciple of Christ should always remember that so long as he lives he is to be a learner. His proper place is at the feet of the great Teacher. What He condescends to impart must be received unhesitatingly as infallible truth. The sum of this teaching we have handed down to us in the revealed Word of God. We should be careful, therefore, always to consult that Holy Oracle, in the spirit of an enquirer, and never more cautiously than when our minds are pretty nearly made up upon any disputed point or doctrine. He that approaches it as if he had nothing to learn will generally leave it having learned nothing; the hungry are filled with good things, while the rich are sent empty away.

"The doctrine of baptisms" is one such disputed point. Almost every one has a settled opinion both as to the proper subjects of the ordinance, and the mode in which it should be administered. In most cases, I fear, it is nothing more than *opinion*, a kind of hereditary creed, which, while it may be very well when it happens to be correct, often forms so faulty a medium of vision, as to distort or altogether conceal the object we desire to examine. There is, therefore, great danger of our coming to the Word of God to demonstrate our theory from it, instead of coming to listen to the voice of the Spirit of Truth; to defend our practice, instead of asking counsel of the Lord.

Supposing, however, some simple, unbiassed enquirer to light upon the passages which stand at the head of this lecture, in his investigation of this subject, what, think you, would be the impression he would gain from them concerning the mode of baptism? The meaning of the verb *baptizo* is

a distinct part of the question under discussion, to be treated of in the next lecture; my supposition, therefore, leaves that for the present unsettled. I am supposing the case of a "plain reader," (so often spoken of by Baptists) one incompetent to form an opinion of its meaning except by the connection in which it occurs. And, I ask again, what would be his conclusion on reading these, and similar passages in the New Testament? Would he, could he for a moment imagine *immersion* to be the mode of baptism indicated? We unhesitatingly answer, no! and we very much doubt if Baptists themselves differ from us in this opinion. Indeed they publicly endorse it by their extreme anxiety to obtain a new version of the English Bible, in which the word *immerse* shall invariably be substituted for *baptize*. They are evidently confident of no great amount of success in converting the world to their opinions, so long as the word remains as at present. Despite all their zeal, and their positiveness as to the meaning of *baptizo*, plain readers of the New Testament will judge of its meaning for themselves, from the connection in which it stands, and the terms with which it is plainly synonimous.

You will remember that our translators have wisely transferred or anglicised the original word *baptizo* to baptize, simply altering its final letter, instead of translating it. Hence, neither party has anything to complain of, as would have been the case had they adopted any one of the seven or eight different renderings of which the word is susceptible. Had it been translated by immerse or dip, those who practise our mode of baptism would have had reason to complain of their having prejudged the case; or, on the other hand, had it been rendered by sprinkle, pour, or cleanse, our Baptist brethren might, with justice, have brought the same complaint against them. They affected no settlement of the question, however, by any deliverance of theirs, but contentedly referred it to the reader to decide, by an examination of the several passages in which the word occurs; and so we are willing to leave it. We think nothing can be fairer. We stand thus on equal footing, and we wonder, therefore, at this anxiety for a new version of the Bible, on the part of those who constantly tell us, that a candid perusal of the New Testament will make any man a Baptist.

But we are digressing, and must return to our text. I have several remarks to offer by way of elucidating its meaning, and exhibiting its bearing upon the question in hand. I remark,—

1. That water baptism is here spoken of as the *inferior*

baptism, being nothing more than the emblem or representative of the *superior* baptism, viz., the baptism of the Holy Ghost. The latter is referred to as exceeding the former in importance, as much as the work of Messiah was to exceed that of John. The difference between the two baptisms was to be as great as the difference between the two administrators. "I indeed baptize you with water, but * * * * He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." All that John could do was to apply the sign; the Messiah alone could confer the thing signified.

2. That the superior baptism must be supposed to indicate, and fix the mode in which the inferior shall be administered, unless there be evidence to the contrary. The type must conform as far as possible to the thing typified. Thus, in the Lord's Supper, the breaking of bread and pouring out of wine, represent, as far as possible, *in mode*, the mangling of the body, and the shedding of the blood of Christ. So the eating and drinking of these emblems represent, in a similar manner, the receiving of Christ into the heart, in the exercise of faith. To attempt to invert their natural order—to make the symbol regulate the mode of the Saviour's death, instead of his death controlling the symbol—would be absurd; no more absurd, however, than it would be to suppose the mode of the Spirit's baptism to have been regulated by its own emblem, the baptism of water. Thus far, I presume, our Baptist friends and we are entirely agreed. I remark,

3. That the same word, *baptizo*, that is employed to designate the baptism of the Holy Spirit, being invariably employed to designate the baptism of water, we are shut up to the conclusion, that the mode of the former was intended to regulate the mode of the latter. If the former was an immersion, so must the latter have been; or if one was an affusion, so must the other have been. This view receives additional confirmation from the fact that the elements used, and hence the baptisms also, possess the same significancy. John uses water, Christ sends a flame of fire,—both employ purifying agents. No one will entertain any doubt as to the design in using water. It clearly exhibits the universal need of spiritual washing, and as clearly teaches us to hope for it from the operation of an influence altogether from without. Should any one question, however, the existence of any such allusion in the baptism of fire, a reference to the following passages will probably satisfy him:—Isa. vi. 7, "And he laid it [a live coal] upon my mouth, and said, Lo, this hath touched thy

lips: and thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin purged." Mal. iii. 2, 3: "He is like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's sope: And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver; and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver." 1 Cor. iii. 13: "The fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is." In each of these passages fire is employed, figuratively, as a purifying agent, while in that from Malachi, both figures are made use of,—refining and washing—and that with especial reference to the work of the Spirit. No one, therefore, can reasonably doubt that the baptism of fire, which is generally supposed to have been first received at Pentecost, was intended, like the baptism of water, to represent the inward cleansing of the Holy Ghost.

Nothing now remains but to show,

4. That the baptism of the Holy Ghost was performed by an *effusion* of his Divine influences, and not by *immersion* in them. The Spirit was "*poured out*" upon the disciples. "Cloven tongues, like as of fire, sat *upon* each of them." All the prophetic allusions to this event, as well as all the phraseology employed in recording it, combine to support this view of the case. The prophecies read:—"I will *pour water upon* him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will *pour my Spirit upon* thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring." Isa. xliv. 3. "Then will I *sprinkle* clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart, also, will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you." Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26. "And it shall come to pass afterwards, that I will *pour out* my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy; your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions. And also upon the servants, and upon the handmaids, in those days will I *pour out* my Spirit." Joel ii. 28, 29. "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations." Isa. lii. 15. The record declares, that the gift of the Holy Ghost "was *poured out*." Acts x. 45: that it "*fell on* all them that heard the word," x. 44; that it was "*shed forth*," in fulfilment of the promise, ii. 33; that it "*came on* them." xix. 6; and that Peter, astonished to see it descend upon the Gentiles also, remembered the word of the Lord Jesus, how that he said, "John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." xi. 16. Could phraseology be more concurrent, without absolute uniformity? Who would ever have thought of immersion as the mode of the Spirit's baptism, had it not been for the desire to support a theory?

Our argument is complete. The two baptisms—of water, and of the Spirit—designated by the same word, and shadowing forth the same truth, were administered in the same mode. The inferior or typical baptism must have conformed, in this respect, to the superior or spiritual, as the earthly takes pattern from the heavenly, (Heb. ix. 23); and hence, whatever can be shown to have been the mode of the Spirit's baptism, must be also the mode of Christian baptism. But we have seen, both from prophetic allusion, and inspired record, that the gift of the Holy Ghost was "*poured out*" upon the disciples; and hence, *affusion* is the scriptural mode of Christian baptism.

It is not a little unfortunate for the theory of immersion, that the application of the blood of Christ should constantly be represented under the figure of sprinkling — the usual method of ritual purification under the Jewish economy. The sprinkling of blood, or water, from the priest's finger, or the hyssop branch, was all that the law required, in most cases, to remove ceremonial uncleanness. See Num. xix. 4, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21. So David prays: "Purge me (sprinkle, Sept.) with hyssop, and I shall be clean." Psalm li. 7. From the frequency with which this form of expression occurs, it is evident that, in the mind of the Jew, ritual purification was associated with the act of sprinkling rather than of immersion,—the application of a small quantity of water to a part of the body, rather than the submersion of the whole.

This fact is of more importance than it might, at first sight, promise to be. The dispute "between some of John's disciples and the Jews, about purifying," shows that the latter regarded the baptism of John as a rite of this nature—a circumstance not easily accounted for, except on the supposition that his act in baptizing, and that of a priest in sprinkling the water of purification, bore a striking resemblance to each other. Immersion was neither required by the Levitical law in any case, nor is there the shadow of evidence that it was ever practised among them. The bathing of the flesh in water, sometimes enjoined, as in the cleansing of the leper, was never performed in that manner; and even had it been, it would prove nothing in favour of immersion, since the word which expresses the act is not *baptizo*, but *louo*, to wash. Indeed, dipping would have been much more likely to have suggested the idea of some heathen lustration, rather than anything Jewish; especially when administered to persons of both sexes, in the presence of a promiscuous multitude.

It is plain, therefore, that inward purification, our need of which is the cardinal truth taught us in baptism, can be symbolized quite as strikingly by sprinkling as by immersion. "He that is washed, needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit;" *i. e.* the validity of the act does not depend upon the application of water to every part of the person.

"But," say our Baptist brethren, "that is a part of *our* case; for the Greek word for *sprinkle* is *rhantizo*, and not *baptizo*." I know it, and Paul knew it, too; and yet he uses the terms synonymously. It will be seen, by referring to Heb. ix. 10, compared with the 13th verse of the same chapter, that the "divers washings" (*baptismois*) spoken of in v. 9, are said to have been performed by the "*sprinkling* (*rhantizousi*) of the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer," upon the unclean, (v. 13); and yet, I presume, no one will dispute Paul's claim to good scholarship, or regard it as at all inferior to that of Carson, Cox, or Gale.

If it be objected, that these "divers baptisms" do not include the sprinklings of blood and ashes, but only the Jewish rites of ablution, we reply, first, that we require some proof that the language has this restricted signification, since, if this objection were true, the enumeration of the observances of the ancient church, in v. 10, would contain not the slightest allusion to the bloody sacrifices which were, confessedly, the most important of them all. This we cannot believe.

But, secondly, suppose the terms not intended to include these sprinklings of blood—what then? Why, to make the objection worth anything, our Baptist brethren must show that the "divers washings" were *all* immersions, while they can produce no evidence that *any* of them were. "Divers," (*diaphorois—different*), they could not have been, had they all been performed in the same manner. At least, then, if we cannot prove that some of these baptisms are called sprinklings, our opponents are still more at a loss to show that they were all immersions, as their theory requires them to do.

We argue, therefore, that since God appointed sprinkling as the emblem and token of purification, employing the word even with reference to the blood of Christ, and the work of the Spirit; since the various washings under the Jewish economy, all, like the ordinance of Christian baptism, setting forth our need of inward cleansing, have been actually called "baptisms" by the inspired Apostle; and,

finally, since the baptism of the Holy Ghost was bestowed by an effusion of his Divine influences upon the disciples—the ordinance of Christian baptism is rightly administered by sprinkling or pouring. Not only is it acceptable in the sight of God thus administered, but we have just as much ground for disputing the validity of immersion, as our Baptist brethren have to dispute the validity of sprinkling.

But to return to our text; we have seen that the action of the Spirit's baptism must determine that of the baptism with water. No just criticism can ever make the mode different in the one case from what it is in the other. To translate *baptizo* when applied to water, by immerse or dip, and when applied to the influences of the Holy Ghost, by any term signifying to pour upon, or affuse, would be a violation of the commonest rules of interpretation too palpable to be allowed for a moment. Besides, our Baptist brethren do not, nay, dare not, admit that it has any other meaning than immerse. To concede that point would endanger their entire theory. Hence, to be consistent as well as safe, they have adopted a rendering of our text, and a number of other passages in which similar phraseology is employed, which is, to say the least, extraordinary. "I indeed immerse you in water, but * * * * He shall *immerse you in the Holy Ghost* and in fire." But truly, if the pressure of a very unpleasant conclusion has driven them to this, they have hardly bettered their case. They have furnished another illustration of the old saying, "Incidit in Scyllam qui vult vitare Charybdis;" or, to quote an equally instructive sentence from Scripture, "It is as if a man did flee from a lion, and a bear met him." Neither horn of the dilemma can allow them much ease; for if they will acknowledge any one to be immersed upon whom only "a cloven tongue, like as of fire," has fallen, they will surely acknowledge the use of water, in similar mode and quantity, to be a valid immersion; and if so, in what do we differ but in the name? Pouring is pouring, and not immersion, in whatever quantity the element may be used; and, therefore, how our brethren can discover an "immersion in the Holy Ghost" in this lambent flame, so partially covering even the head of the baptized, we cannot divine! They are surely much more easily satisfied with the emblem of the Spirit's influence, than they are with water; for in the use of the latter, nothing less than entire submersion will satisfy them.

But, it may be said, the disciples "were filled with the Holy Ghost," and will not that justify the use of the term immerse? I answer, No! for several reasons:

First. That was plainly the effect, and not the mode, of the baptism, the inward spiritual grace of which the fire was the emblem. As well, therefore, might we speak of one being immersed in faith or repentance.

Secondly. The cloven tongue "sat upon each of them," and could not be said, with any propriety, to have filled them. But even had it entered and pervaded them, it would still have been an *infusion*, rather than an *immersion*.

And, thirdly. Whatever may have been the nature of the baptism, the influence and the emblem both descended upon them all, attended with "a sound from heaven," *i. e.* from above them; and this, we repeat, is the characteristic of affusion. In no conceivable sense can the disciples be said to have been dipped or plunged into the fiery emblem, or into the Holy Ghost. It surely must require very special pleading, therefore, to satisfy even Baptists themselves with the rendering of their new Version. Our own decided conviction is, that what they need, in order to help them over the difficulty, is a new Version of the *Greek* text, not of the English: nothing less will meet the case. Assuredly, if the plain reader of our present authorized version is unconvinced by it of the Divine right of immersion, he will be farther than ever from it, when he learns that it looks for support to such wretched perversions of Scripture thought and language as that just referred to.

Perhaps some one may be waiting with another objection. It may be urged, that the prepositions with which *baptizo* is generally construed are "*en*" and "*eis*," the primary meaning of which is *in* and *into*, respectively, and hence that they should have been so rendered. The same objector will probably add, that in strict accordance with this view, the preposition "*ek*," *out of*, is used in Acts viii. 39, to describe the act of leaving the water, after baptism.

The objections are plausible enough, and have doubtless perplexed the minds of many who have heard them. It will be necessary, therefore, to examine them, and ascertain their value.

First, as to "*En.*" Its primary meaning we admit to be *in*, but that is saying very little more than that it has another, or several other meanings; for a primary involves a secondary. To demand, therefore, that we invariably translate it *in*, whenever it is construed with *baptizo*, is to ignore all its other significations, in the eager attempt to defeat an opponent. Two or three facts may help us to understand this question. Schleusner, a very able lexicographer,

assigns to this preposition no less than thirty-six different meanings in the Greek New Testament; and it is actually translated, in our English version, by thirty-two different words. *In three hundred and thirteen instances* of its occurrence it is rendered by *at, on,* or *with,—e. g.*, "coming in and going out *at* (*en*) Jerusalem;" "who is set *on* (*en*) the right hand of God;" "entereth into the holy place *with* (*en*) blood." To be consistent, our Baptist brethren should render it *in*, in each of these instances, and hundreds of others, because that is its primary meaning. But if they will not stake their scholarship upon such a translation, they will surely allow us to understand that John baptized *with* (*en*) water, *at* (*en*) the Jordan.

In our text, however, as well as in several others, the verb is construed without a preposition, the noun being put simply in the dative case. The English translators had, therefore, to supply one, and they have very properly inserted *with*. Anthon, in his "Greek Syntax." says concerning this construction, "The means *by* which, and the instrument *with* which a thing is accomplished, are both put in the dative—as, 'the enemy threw *with* stones, and struck *with* swords;' 'we see *with* the two eyes,' &c." Hence, we are not only unassailable in the use of *with* instead of *in*, but the usage of language requires it.

We come now to "*Eis*" and "*Ek*," which in Acts viii. 38, 39, (the only instance in which they occur in conjunction,) are translated "*into*" and "*out of*." Upon these two prepositions our Baptist brethren build their argument for immersion, so far as the case of the eunuch is concerned. We are often pointed to the expressions referred to, as evidence amounting almost to demonstration, that he, at any rate, was immersed. "They went down both *into* the water, both Philip and the eunuch: and he baptized him," &c.

Now, to say the least, the narrative itself, apart from the rendering given to these prepositions, is no more in favour of immersion, than it is of affusion. Let any one read it, "They went down both *to* the water * * * and came up *from* the water," and he will see nothing left in it that does not agree with the latter mode quite as much as with the former.

The eunuch, who had just been reading of Messiah—"so shall he sprinkle many nations," Isa. lii. 15—being desirous of testifying his faith in Jesus, as the one to whom the prophet referred, and suddenly seeing water before him, asks, "What doth hinder me to be baptized?" After

reading of sprinkling, and knowing that to be a common Jewish act, would he imagine that baptism was to be administered by immersion? Did he, before all his attendants, in the face of day, change his clothing for baptism, and again attire himself for his journey? Or did he sacrifice comfort and appearance to his sense of delicacy, and ride on in his wet clothing?

Furthermore, the locality through which the eunuch was journeying was "*desert,*" (v. 26,) a very unlikely spot in which to find a stream of water deep enough for an immersion. Jerome, writing about three hundred years after, calls it "a small brook,,' such as we often cross in a country road,—a clear proof that he did not believe that the eunuch was dipped; and modern travellers assure us that no traces of it remain at the present day.

The entire weight of the argument, therefore, rests upon the force of the prepositions employed; and, truly, the burden is greater than they can bear. For, in the first place, there is no sufficient reason for translating them as has been done in the narrative referred to, as will be at once apparent from the following carefully ascertained facts:—"*eis*" is rendered "*to,*" or "*unto,*" in our English version, almost as frequently as "*into,*" or 538 times against 575. In the Acts of the Apostles, indeed, the book in which the disputed terms occur, and therefore the best to determine their meaning, it is rendered "*to,*" or "*unto,*" more frequently than "*into*" the number of instances being 119 against 89.

"*Ek*" is rendered more frequently "*from,*" than "*out of,*" in whichever way you make the comparison, the number of instances being, in the Acts, 25 against 19, or in the New Testament, 186 against 153. And,

Secondly. Even were their present rendering unexceptionable, the countenance they lend to immersion is much more in appearance than in fact; for, if "*eis*" and "*ek*" prove the immersion of the eunuch, they equally prove the immersion of Philip, since "they went down *both* into the water." Little intractable words! They express either too little or too much, let the Baptist translate them as he will. Our rendering he cannot receive without abandoning his argument; while his own leads him *into* difficulties *out of* which he finds it impossible to extricate himself. One would think no one could fail to see that going down to, or into, the water, was only *getting into position* for baptism; and that coming up from, or out of, the water, was only *leaving the stream* after baptism. Any other view

makes the writer guilty of ridiculous repetition, since he immediately adds, "and he baptized him." The emphasis, therefore, which our Baptist brethren uniformly lay upon these simple words in reading the narrative, is altogether uncalled for. They may, in such a way, strengthen their prejudices, but they weaken their argument. The proof is yet wanting, that Philip and the eunuch wet even their sandals in the act of baptism; though even if it could be demonstrated that they stood in the water ancle-deep, or knee-deep, the evidence of an immersion would be as scanty as ever, since the baptism might still have been administered by pouring or sprinkling,—a mode entirely agreeing with many very ancient representations of the baptism of our Lord.

And this reminds us that, in both accounts of His baptism, in Matt. iii. 16, and Mark i. 10, the preposition "*apo*," the primary signification of which is undoubtedly, *from*, is used instead of "*ek*." It occurs in the New Testament altogether 651 times, in 374 of which it is rendered by our translators, "*from*;" while in only *forty-four* instances is it rendered "*out of*." Luke (iii. 21) simply records the fact, without giving us any particulars; but in ch. iv. 1, he informs us that, "Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost, returned from (*apo*) Jordan." Thus, in three instances, "*apo*" is used to describe the act of leaving the water after baptism, while "*ek*" is employed in only one; or, putting the two words together, they are translated in our New Testament, "*out of*," in only 197 instances; while they are translated "*from*," no less than 560 times! Hence the evidence in favour of the latter rendering is nearly as three to one, as compared with the former. Or, to take another view of the question, our Baptist brethren would have us render both "*apo*" and "*ek*" "*out of*," while the former, occurring 651 times in the New Testament, has been translated "*from*," in 374 instances, and "*out of*," in only 44; and while the latter, occurring about 900 times, has been translated "*from*," in 186 instances, and "*out of*," in only 153.* Surely, nothing could be more unreasonable.

We arrive, then, at the following conclusions relative to the prepositions with which *baptizo* is construed, or which usually attend it:—

---

* The reader may verify all these statements by a reference to Bagster's "Englishman's Greek Concordance." Harper and Brothers' edition. New York. 1855.

1. That while none of them can be legitimately quoted as opposed to the idea of affusion, some of them manifestly accord best with the view we have taken of the baptism of the Saviour by John, and of the eunuch by Philip. None of them afford any reliable evidence of immersion in either case. And,

2. That we are thrown back again for the decision of this question, upon the meaning of *baptizo*, as determined by its use in the New Testament and the classics.

This is, perhaps, the best place to discuss another objection to our mode of baptism, founded upon two passages of Scripture, to which Baptists always appeal with great confidence, as presenting evidence in favour of immersion perfectly overwhelming: we mean Rom. vi. 4, and Col. ii. 12. We shall confine ourselves to an examination of the former of the two, since any remarks that affect the meaning of the one, have an equal bearing upon that of the other. The words upon which so much stress is laid are, "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death;" and these are paraphrased by such expressions as "following Christ to a watery grave," "buried beneath the bending wave" &c.,—phrases that have become so stereotyped that no one who uses them questions for a moment the scripturalness of the ideas they convey. An opinion, therefore, which has, in many cases, been instilled into the mind from infancy, and is continually reproduced in sermons and prayers, we cannot hope soon to change. What has not been reasoned into us cannot easily be reasoned out of us. Nevertheless, believing the Apostle's language to be totally misapplied by our Baptist brethren, as some of their own writers admit, I shall endeavour, first, to show the ground on which I differ from them, and then, to present what I conceive to be the true import of the passage.

1. My first objection to their view of it is, that it assigns a significancy to the *mode* of baptism, while the New Testament uniformly represents the significancy as attaching to the *baptism* itself. Where, except in these two disputed passages, does it ever teach any other truth than our need of spiritual, internal cleansing? The Lord's supper, its associate ordinance, sets forth *one* great truth,—our need of pardon through the application of the blood of Christ,—and that is set forth not in any case in the *mode* in which it is administered or received, but solely in the use of the *elements* themselves. So, baptism is everywhere else represented as teaching the one great, and equally im-

portant truth of our need of the renewing influences of the Holy Spirit—both pardon and renewal being essential to our admission into the kingdom of heaven.

2. The view I am opposing makes baptism significant and commemorative of truths, the setting forth of which the Saviour has specially assigned to *other institutions* of the Christian religion. Dr. Carson says, "To be born of water most evidently implies that water is the *womb* out of which the person born proceeds." Farther on he tells us that "the *washing* of the believer *in the blood of Christ* is figuratively represented by the water of baptism." Again, "words cannot more plainly teach anything than that in baptism we are *buried* with Christ." And, lastly, "It (baptism) is designed to point out our own resurrection, as well as the resurrection of Christ." A strange jumble of ideas, truly!—pardon of sin, the washing of regeneration, the new birth from the womb of the water, and the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and of the believer with him. If baptism teaches us all this, it is surely not the simple ordinance I take it to be. Has the Lord's Supper but *one* meaning, and has Baptism *five or six*, and some of them of the most opposite nature? Besides, the death of Christ is shown forth by a special commemorative ordinance,—the Supper,—and is not that sufficient? Shall baptism usurp its office, and teach *the same truth*, when its original significancy was *cleansing?* So, also, the resurrection of Christ has its appropriate remembrancer in the change of the day of rest, from the seventh, to the first day of the week. What need, then, of another?

3. If there be any allusion in the passage to the *mode* of baptism, it is said to resemble the manner of Christ's *death*, rather than that of his *burial*. "We have been planted together [*i. e.* baptized] in the likeness of his death," v. 5. Hence, had any mode been prescribed, it would probably have been that of the Episcopal church, which administers it with the *sign of the cross*, or, in other words, in the likeness of his death, which was accomplished by crucifixion. The terms are singularly unhappy for the hypothesis of immersion. How perfectly meaningless would be, "immersed in the likeness of his crucifixion!"

4. There is no such resemblance between the immersion of a believer, and the burial of Christ, as some have supposed to exist. Burial among the Romans, to whom this language was originally addressed, was performed by burning the corpse, and depositing its ashes in an urn. Without some explanation, therefore, of the manner of the

Saviour's burial, the entire allusion would have been unintelligible to them. But the Apostle offered no such explanation, and if he had, it would have bewildered rather than have enlightened them. The body of our Lord was not lowered into the grave *perpendicularly*, as is the case in modern burial, but was placed in a sepulchre hewn out of a rock, *laterally*. An examination of John xx. 11, 12, will show this to have been the case: Mary "stooped down, and looked into the sepulchre, and seeth two angels in white sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain." The doorway of such a sepulchre was usually from three to four feet in height; hence the stooping, in order to look into the chamber of the dead. A writer in Kitto's "Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature," (art. *Burials*,) says, "Many such are still found in Palestine, along the sides of which niches are cut, or sometimes shelves ranged one above another, on which were deposited the bodies of the dead; while in others the ground floor of the tomb was raised so as to make different compartments, the lowest place in the family vaults being reserved for the servants." Again, speaking of those hewn out of the rock, as was our Lord's, he says, the entrance to these "was either horizontal, or by a flight of steps." Where now is the similarity between a person walking into a baptistery, and being plunged perpendicularly under the water for a moment, and the body of Jesus, wound up in grave-clothes, being gently borne along to the sepulchre, and there deposited sidewise upon one of these ledges of rock? The one walks into his watery tomb, the other is borne to his on a bier; the one is plunged under the water that is said to bury him, the other is lifted up to his resting place rather than let down; the one is enveloped with the water, which comes into contact with every part of his body, the other is placed within the cave, without any contact with it at all: and lastly, the one is popped under the water for the shortest possible moment, the other peacefully sleeps in the sepulchre till the third day! Truly, the argument from any supposed likeness between the burial of the Lord, and the immersion of the believer, is rather one of sound than of sense. We are persuaded that it derives all its force from ignorantly or unconsciously associating the forms of modern, instead of Jewish burial, with the language alluded to.

5. Baptism is declared by the Apostle to unite us to Christ in three respects:—(1) We are baptized into Christ, *i. e.*, into his *life;* (2) We are baptized into his *death;* and

(3) Into his *burial and resurrection*. Now, it is quite as important that our fellowship with him in his life and death should be represented by some symbolic act, as our fellowship with him in his burial and resurrection. Hence, either the language contains no reference, whatever, to the *mode* of baptism, or it must prescribe a mode which shall, with equal clearness, set forth our relationship to Christ in all these three respects. But where shall we find such a mode? The Roman Catholic uses salt, oil, and spittle, to represent his teaching, munificence, and miracles; the Episcopalian uses the sign of the cross to represent his death; and the Baptist, immersion, to represent his burial and resurrection. To attempt a combination of the three modes would be manifestly absurd; and yet some such combination would be necessary to set forth all that is involved in the act of self-consecration to Christ. We conclude, therefore, that there is no allusion in the passage to any mode of baptism.

6. We are said to be buried *with* Christ, not *like* Christ, as our Baptist brethren seem to read the passage. No likeness whatever is said to exist between the manner of our burial and that of Christ. The prefix to the verb suggests companionship with Christ in his burial, rather than any similitude between the acts performed,—our sympathy with him in the objects for which he suffered. As he died for sin, and was buried, so we die to sin, and are buried with him; and as he rose for our justification, so we rise to newness of life. Our burial is, of course, only figurative; and, therefore, to represent that by another symbolic act, such as immersion, would be to make immersion the figure of a figure, the shade of a shadow, the type of another type, which is hardly less than absurd.

7. The Baptist view of this passage does not suit the context, and the scope of the Apostle's argument. He is anticipating the objection to the doctrine of salvation by grace, that men will sin that grace may abound, and showing that the reception of the Gospel does in reality tend to holiness and not to sin. The 3rd and 4th verses are the proof he offers of this:—"Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death," &c. Now, upon the supposition that the burial is only another term for immersion, the Apostle is made to assign the fact of their baptism as proof that believers will walk in newness of life! A strange argument, truly, for an inspired Apostle to use—"We cannot continue in sin, for we

have been buried with Christ in baptism, *i. e., immersed!*" We submit, however, that such is the argument of the 6th of Romans, if the Baptist view of the words under discussion be the correct one. And when we find language like the following from Dr. Carson, we are almost led to the belief that some, at least, regard such an argument as sound and convincing—"That we have died along with Christ, he [the Apostle] *proves from our baptism.*"* To modify his language, as he afterwards does, by telling us that "our death along with Him is *implied* in being baptized into his death," is, in our opinion, to give up the point for which he is contending; for the thing *implied* in baptism—our renewal by the Holy Ghost—is the proof the Apostle produces that salvation by grace is not liable to the supposed objection—not baptism itself. The argument would then stand, not, "we cannot continue in sin, for we have been immersed," but, "we cannot continue in sin, for we have experienced that of which baptism is the emblem,—the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." The allusion to water baptism, if there be any in the passage, is entirely incidental, and derives all its significance from the fact, and not from the mode, of its administration. As burial is the last and most indisputable proof of natural death, finally and publicly separating the deceased from the world around him, so the baptism of these Roman christians formally separated them from the unbelieving world around them. They had died to sin the moment they exercised faith in the dying Saviour, and so they were buried with him,—buried to the world, and thus publicly separated from it—when they professed faith in his name.

I cannot but regard the entire passage, therefore, as figurative. Every other term employed, down to the 11th verse, is certainly so;—"dead to sin;" "planted together;" the "old man crucified with him that the body of sin might be destroyed;" "freed from sin;" "dead with Christ;" "dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God." How purely gratuitous, therefore, to say the least, to make the burial a *physical* act, when the death, planting, and resurrection are *spiritual!*

---

* Edinburgh edition; 1831; page 170. The italics are mine.

LECTURE III.

THE MODE OF BAPTISM.—(*Continued.*)

ACTS x. 47:—"*Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?*"

IN my last lecture I endeavoured to show the primitive mode of Christian baptism from analogy, laying the foundation of my argument in the fact that the inspired writers uniformly represent the baptism of the Holy Ghost, of which water baptism is the emblem, as, not an immersion, but an affusion—a descent, or pouring out, upon the disciples, of his sacred influences. I argued that the mode of the former must have determined the mode of the latter, especially since the word which is used of them both, is the same; and that we have, therefore, very strong presumptive evidence that the primitive mode was pouring.

I endeavoured, further, to show that the usage of the Greek prepositions, with which *baptizo* is construed, is, to say the least, not unfavourable to this view in any instance, while in respect of some of them, it is decidedly favourable to it. Thus far, I think I may say, we have found the evidence in support of immersion very meagre indeed; and had any impartial enquirer been following us in our investigation, as I must hope many have been, he would now return to the subject with impressions altogether in favour of our mode of baptism.

We come now, as our next step, to examine the meaning of the word *baptizo*, the term which is invariably employed in the Greek New Testament, to designate the ordinance of Christian baptism. Our Baptist brethren affirm, in the most emphatic manner possible, that it *always* signifies to immerse or dip, *i. e.*, to plunge a person or thing totally under the water, or other element with which the act is performed. Dr. Carson, to whom I have had occasion already to refer as a very high authority among our opponents, publishes in capitals, "My position is, that it always signifies to dip, never expressing anything but mode." Dr. McClay, late President of the American Bible Union, says, "It might as well be translated, 'to eat roast beef,' as 'to sprinkle.'" Drs. Cox and Gale are equally

positive, though a little less vulgar. In fact, this is the Baptist's sheet anchor, to lose which is to lose the ship.

On the other hand, Pædo-baptists, with quite an equal array of scholarship, and I do not know but a good deal more modesty, affirm that it does *not* always signify to immerse or dip; and that it does not I am now prepared to prove.

Before proceeding to do so, however, we must define the term immerse, since even its meaning may not be distinctly understood. Immersion, then, is performed by the plunging of the person into, or under the water,—the application of the subject to the element; while affusion is performed by the application of the element to the subject—pouring the water upon the person. This, mark you, is not my interpretation of the word, but that of Baptists themselves. Dr. Carson, speaking of the dew-baptized Nebuchadnezzar, says, "If all the water of the ocean had *fallen on* him, it would not have been a literal *immersion*;" or, in other words, a man at the bottom of the ocean cannot be considered as immersed, unless he has been *plunged* to the bottom of it. A village may be buried beneath an avalanche of snow, or completely inundated by the overflow of some mighty river, but neither the avalanche nor the river could *immerse* it, since immersion can be performed in only one way, viz., by plunging the person or thing into the water. *The mode of contact*, and not *the quantity of water*, determines the nature of the act. Hence, if I succeed in adducing one clear example from the Classics, Septuagint, or New Testament, in which the disputed word means something *else*, or something *less*, than a total immersion—as, for example, rushing upon, overwhelming, drenching, &c.—I establish my position, and our Baptist brethren ought to acknowledge themselves defeated; but if I fail to produce any such instance, I will acknowledge that I am defeated. I do not for one moment dispute that it *sometimes* demands the interpretation which our Baptist brethren uniformly give to it. It is frequently used in the sense of drowning and sinking; and, therefore, quotations from Greek authors, to prove that to have been one of its meanings, are altogether unnecessary,—a work of supererrogation. Nay, such quotations evade the question. What our Baptist friends have to do, is to prove their own assertion, that it *never means anything else* than immerse, and that they are much slower to attempt.

I shall not encumber my lecture with a long list of learned men about whom you know nothing, who have as-

signed more meanings than one to the word in question. Great names cannot decide this controversy; though, if they could, we are quite prepared to abide this test also. And even had we no great names to publish, as holding our view, we should be prepared to settle the point by the admissions and self-contradictions of Baptist writers themselves. Let me give you one, as a specimen, from Dr. Carson. Immediately after announcing his position, that *baptizo* "always signifies to dip," he adds, "Now, *as I have all the lexicographers and commentators against me in this opinion*, it will be neccessary to say a word or two with respect to the authority of lexicons."* He then tells us that as "lexicographers have been guided by their own judgment in examining the various passages in which the word occurs, it is still competent for every man to have recourse to the same sources." Most certainly; but to us it does seem to savour not a little of presumption, and determination to see and know nothing but immersion, for even Alexander Carson to set up his judgment against the unanimous decision of "all the lexicographers and commentators." It is surely, to use his own expression, "an instance of the boldest scepticism." Here we have *Dr. Carson* vs. *the World!* We can hardly be long in deciding upon whose judgment to rely. Imagine a parallel case:—All the scientific men of the world, from the days of Galileo and Isaac Newton down to the present, have been agreed that the Copernican theory of our planetary system is the correct one,—that the earth revolves on its own axis, and performs an annual revolution round the sun. A thousand times has this been demonstrated, till any additional proof seems only an encumbrance. But now, up starts some amateur astronomer, who tells us, "My position is,—notwithstanding that all the astronomers and scientific men of the last two or three centuries are against me in my opinion,—my position is, that the earth stands still, and that the sun revolves round it." What would you think of the modesty of such a man, to say nothing of his claim to rank among men of science? Yet is not this precisely Dr. Carson's position,—one he seems, indeed, to have courted? Talk of the admissions of Pædo-baptists after that! Where do our Baptist friends find anything at all equal to it?

We beg to submit a query or two on this quotation, before dismissing it:

---

* Page 54.

1. If *baptizo* "*always* signifies to *dip*," how comes it that Dr. Carson is betrayed into speaking of its *primary* meaning? *E. g.*, he says, (page 56,) "Parkhurst gives *six* meanings to *baptizo;* I undertake to prove that it has but *one:* yet he and I do not differ about the *primary* meaning of the word." Now, primary is to most minds a term suggestive of something *secondary*—they are correlates. Dr. Carson is inconsistent with himself, and surely *he* is not the one to instruct "lexicographers and commentators" in the use of words.

Besides, *dip* and *immerse* are terms not exactly synonimous: the former often expresses much less than the latter. Immersion always involves dipping, but dipping does not always involve immersion. Aware, doubtless, of this distinction, Baptist writers are generally very guarded in the use to which they put them. Nothing but *immerse*, and its derivatives, will suit them in translating the New Testament, or in speaking of the ordinance of Christian baptism; to designate an immersion as a dipping, or those who practise it as Dippers, would be at once regarded as an offence, though we certainly cannot imagine why it should be, if *baptizo* "always signifies to dip." On the other hand, *dip* is generally employed to convey its meaning when it occurs in the classics, because, we presume, they think it less awkward to speak of "*dipping* hay into honey," as Aristotle does, than of *immersing* hay in honey. We claim that the maintenance of such a distinction is unfair, if the original word have but one meaning. If it signify to dip, then let our Baptist friends change their name, and their phraseology, to accord with it; but if it mean to immerse, let them fairly meet the difficulties to which an uniform translation of it exposes them.

2. If "all the lexicographers and commentators" are against Dr. Carson, whence come the long lists of names, and quotations from Pædo-baptist writers which are sometimes published as favouring immersion? We have seen Chalmers' honoured name, and even Greville Ewing's, mentioned; while every body knows that Chalmers, a commentator, and Ewing, a lexicographer, were both, in principle and practice, opposed to that mode. We fear some little chicanery is sometimes practised in this way. One thing is evident with respect to all such quotations,—the writers referred to either were honest and conscientious in the practice of their mode of baptism, or they were not. If they *were*, their admissions, which Baptists are so fond of parading about, clearly were not of sufficient importance

to lead them to alter their practice: if they *were not*, their admissions are entitled to no weight with others. Hence, all such quotations we set down as evidence of one fact, and one only, which is, that they are adduced for want of anything better.

And 3. If "all the lexicographers and commentators" assign to *baptizo* other meanings than the one given by Dr. Carson, is not the Baptist body "a house divided against itself" on this point? Gill and Ripley must have differed from Carson, for they were commentators; and surely *they* could have had no "turn to serve" as he suspects some have had, in assigning secondary meanings to *baptizo*, for they were Baptists. But alas! doctors are proverbial for differing.

The ablest and most reliable authorities assign from five to eight meanings to the word in question, every one of which is well sustained by examples of its use in classical and sacred writings. But, unexceptionable and overwhelming as this testimony is, it becomes, if possible, more convincing still from the fact that the word has been rendered into English, in the translations of various classical works, by at least forty-two different words, among which may be found the following:—*to stain, daub, dye, imbue, dip, plunge, drown, sink, wash, wet, overflow, overwhelm, oppress, pour, soak, sprinkle, tinge, fill.* Now, you will observe, we do not simply affirm that *baptizo* is *capable* of so many translations, but that learned men,—the most eminent Greek scholars, to whom the language was as familiar as their mother tongue,—in endeavouring faithfully to express its meaning in English, have actually employed all these forty-two words, and have done so without any reference whatever to this controversy. That is a *hard fact* for our Baptist friends. Imagine, then, the utter nonsense that would have been produced by invariably rendering it, immerse, or dip! The English reader may obtain some idea of it, by procuring a list of the passages in which the original word occurs in the New Testament, and attempting so to translate it. Look, for instance, at Matt. xx. 22, 23: "Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be dipped with the dipping that I am dipped with?" "Ye shall indeed drink of my cup, and be dipped with the dipping that I am dipped with," &c. Mark i. 4, 8: "John did dip in the wilderness, and preach the dipping of repentance." "He shall dip you in the Holy Ghost." Mark vii. 4: "And when they come from the market, except they dip themselves, they

eat not. And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the dipping of * * * tables;" (or, couches.) 1 Cor. x. 2: "All our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were all dipped unto (or into) Moses, in the cloud and in the sea." The substitution of the word immerse for dip, will be found equally awkward.

But I am pledged to establish my position with regard to *baptizo*, and I shall support it,

I. By quotations from the Classics. The following have been selected with the view of exhibiting several of its more prominent significations.

1. "The Phenicians * * * * came to certain desert places, abounding with rushes and sea-weed, which at ebb-tide are not *overflowed*, (*baptizesthai*), but which at full tide are deluged."—*Aristotle.* In this instance the word is manifestly used to express the *rushing* of the tide *upon* the sea-weed. The rising tide *baptized* them, but could not *immerse* them, for in immersing, as I before remarked, the person or thing is plunged *into* the water, and not simply wetted or covered *with* it.

2. "Of the land animals, a great part, overtaken by the river, are destroyed, being overwhelmed (*baptizomena*)."—*Diodorus Siculus.*

3. "The river rushing down with a stronger current, *overwhelmed* (*ebaptize*) many with water."—*Ibid.* To both of these passages from Diodorus Siculus, the comment upon the preceding one applies. Here, again, there was baptism, even to drowning, but no immersion, since the river rushed *upon* them.

4. "I myself also am one of those who were yesterday *drenched* (*bebaptismenōn*) with wine."—*Plato.*

5. "Having made Alexander *drunk* (*baptisasa*) with much wine."—*Ibid.*

6. "*Drenched* (*bebaptismenōn*) to insensibility and sleep by intemperance."—*Josephus.*

Examples of the employment of the word in this latter sense abound. Will our Baptist friends tell us that these parties were *immersed* in wine, or *dipped* into intemperance? I have read of some one in English history who, having to die, and being permitted to choose the manner of his death, requested that he might be drowned in a butt of wine, and was so executed, That was being *immersed* in wine, but assuredly no quantity of it poured down a man's throat can immerse him.

7. "For as plants are nourished by moderate, but choked

by excessive watering, in like manner the mind is enlarged by labours suited to its strength, but is *overwhelmed* (*baptizetai,*) by such as exceed its power."—*Plutarch.* In this instance it is undoubtedly used with the meaning of *pouring upon,*—the mode in which water is applied to plants.

8. "He who bears with difficulty the burden he already has, would be entirely *overwhelmed* (*baptistheie*) by a small addition."—*Libanius.*

9. "I am one of those who have been *overwhelmed* (*bebaptismenōn*) by that great wave of calamity."—*Ibid.*

10. "*Oppressed* (*bebaptismenoi*) by a debt of 5000 myriads."—*Plutarch.* Nothing can be plainer, one would think, than that, in all these cases, the baptism was performed from *above*—by rushing, pouring, pressing *upon* the person or thing baptized, and not by plunging it *into* anything. Hence, *baptizo* does not "always signify to dip," nor does it always express a particular mode.

II. By quotations from the New Testament and Septuagint.

1. We have already examined somewhat minutely several passages in which the Baptism of the Holy Ghost was promised, and have shown that the promise was fulfilled by the *effusion* and *descent* of his gracious influences on the day of Pentecost, and subsequent occasions. The word occurs so frequently in this connection, and with the unquestionable signification of pouring upon, that I shall content myself with simply naming a few of them, and dismissing them. Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16; John i. 33; Acts i. verse 5 compared with verse 8; and Acts xi. 15, 16.

2. Turn now to Mark vii. 4, already alluded to: "The *baptism* (*baptismous*), or purifying of * * * tables," or couches, on which, according to Eastern manners, they were accustomed to recline at meals. The question then arises, were these couches,—from fifteen to twenty feet in length, and of proportionate width,—taken to some river and dipped, as often as they suffered ceremonial defilement, or was there some convenience in every house for dipping them? Either one or the other must have been the fact, if the word *baptizo* necessarily and invariably signifies to dip. Or, were the couches cleansed, as would be most natural, and most in accordance with the Jewish ritual, by applying water to them? Barnes, the careful student and annotator, says upon this passage, "It cannot be supposed that couches were entirely immersed in water;

the word baptism, here, must therefore denote some other application of water, by sprinkling, or otherwise. If the word *here* is used, as is clear, to denote anything except immersion, it may be *elsewhere;* and baptism is lawfully performed without immersing the whole body in water." The supposition that the couches were taken to pieces to dip them, is a purely gratuitous assumption to meet the difficulties of a hard-pressed theory.

3. The next to which I shall call your attention is to be found in 1 Cor. x. 2: "Our fathers * * * * were all *baptized* (*ebaptizanto*) unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Times without number has this passage been tortured and twisted to make it utter, if with never so faint and faltering a voice, "*immersed* unto Moses, &c." But as firmly as any sturdy old Reformer, it absolutely refuses to recant.

(*a*) They were baptized "in the *cloud*." Now, if the definition I have given of immersion be correct, it could not have been performed, in this instance, without lifting up the whole camp of Israel into the cloud. Dr. Gill, indeed, an eminent Baptist commentator, supposes that the cloud "let down a plentiful rain upon them, whereby they were in such a condition as if they had been all over dipped in water;"—that was the best *he* could make of it. But even so, how does that better his case? If "all the water of the ocean," *falling upon* a man, cannot immerse him, as Carson contends, how much less a soaking rain! But if the clouds are permitted to perform their baptism by pouring, why may not we? And if Paul regarded that mode as valid among Jews, would he have doubted its validity, think you, among Christians?

(*b*) They were baptized "in the *sea*." The same learned doctor supposes here, again, that as the waters stood up above their heads, "they *seemed to be* immersed in it;"—that was the best he could do with that sentence. But will our Baptist brethren be satisfied with dipping a man into an empty baptistery, because he *seems* to be immersed in it? I trow not; and hence cannot help asking, with Barnes, "whether, if immersion was the only mode of baptism known in the New Testament, the Apostle Paul would have used the word, not only so as not necessarily to imply that, but as *necessarily* to mean something else?"

4. In Heb. ix. 10, the phrase, "divers *washings*" (*baptismois*)—literally, different baptisms,—occurs; but as we have already examined it in a previous lecture, we shall dismiss it with a single remark or two. First—The

sprinklings of blood and ashes, referred to in v. 13, afford a very simple and natural explanation of the Apostle's meaning in v. 10. Secondly—there is no evidence whatever, of immersion having been one of the "divers washings" of the Mosaic ritual. Yet, thirdly—our Baptist friends must prove that all these *different* baptisms were performed in the *same* manner,—by immersion,—otherwise, the phrase opposes insuperable objections to their view of the meaning of *baptizo*.

5. My last example of the use of this word I shall adduce from the Septuagint. It is found in Judith xii. 7,—an uninspired book, but, as a source of reference on this subject, next in value to the New Testament, having been written but a century or two before it. Judith, from whom the book takes its name, is there said to have *washed* herself, (*ebaptizeto*) at a fountain of water, in the midst of a camp of 20,000 soldiers. I need not ask if this was performed by immersion; delicacy forbids the thought. Nor is there the slightest evidence of it in the passage itself, for she washed *at the well*, or fountain, (*epi te pege*),—the very same terms being employed as are used in John iv. 6: "Jesus being wearied with his journey, sat thus *on the well.*" There is, therefore, just as much reason to suppose that Jesus sat *in* the well at Sychar, as that Judith immersed herself *in* the fountain at Bethulia. These are by no means the only examples that I might have adduced from the New Testament, or Septuagint, but I have furnished eleven, in addition to the ten from the Classics, in none of which can *baptizo* be shown to have implied immersion; and that should suffice.

We pass on now to the evidence furnished,

III. By quotations illustrating the use of *bapto*, which has generally been regarded by Baptist writers as exactly synonimous with *baptizo*. Dr. Carson says of it, "As to totality of immersion, the one is perfectly equivalent to the other,"* and Gale, Booth, and McLean agree with him. Hence, if any example can be produced, in which it can be shown to signify anything less than a total immersion, it will equally establish my position with reference to *baptizo*.

1. We have already referred to one in Aristotle, in which he speaks of "dipping hay into honey," or *baptizing* (*baptontes*) hay *with* honey, for diseased

* Page 8.

elephants. The passage may be rendered in either way, and we are not particular which is adopted; for, whether the hay was dipped into the honey, or the honey put upon the hay, in neither case could it have amounted to a complete immersion.

2. In a mock-heroic poem, at one time attributed to Homer, but now supposed to have been the production of a later writer, a frog is represented as being killed by a mouse, (Dr. Carson reverses it, by mistake, but it is of no consequence), and *baptizing* (*ebapteto*) the lake with its blood. Now, if *bapto* is "perfectly equivalent" to *baptizo*, and *baptizo* "always signifies to dip," it must follow that the lake was *dipped*, or *immersed* in the blood of this frog! Dr. Carson, indeed, tries to get out of the difficulty by rendering the word, in this instance, *to dye;* but then what becomes of his own assertion respecting its meaning? Dr. Gale, with more courage, stands up to his mark like a man, and tells us, "the lake was *dipped in blood*"—the blood of a frog! What, we may exclaim, what will not attachment to theory do! We have all heard of the mighty feats of logic, but surely this was never exceeded!

3. Aristophanes says of a certain colouring matter, "When squeezed it *stains* (*baptei*) the hand."

4. The same writer, describing some theatrical performers, says, "Their faces were *daubed* (*baptomenos*) with tawny colours,"—lees of wine, and other odd substances.

5. Again, from the same—"Speak plainly to me, lest I *paint* (*bapso*) thee with purple colours." Scarcely a word of comment can be needed upon the last three examples; in neither case can immersion have been intended. We smear, or paint a thing, by putting the colour *on to* the article, and not by putting the article *into* the colour. Such is the mode indicated by *bapto* in these quotations, and Dr. Gale is constrained to admit it, at least in relation to the first of them.

6. Ælion uses the word in the sense of anointing or impregnating: "Having *anointed* (*bapsas*) a crown with ointment;" or, "having dipped a crown into ointment;"—either rendering is altogether opposed to the idea of a total immersion.

7. My last example from the Classics is from Suidas de Hierocle, who records of some one who had been scourged before the tribunal, that, "having *wetted* (*bapsas*) the hollow of his hand [with his blood] he sprinkled it on the judgment seat." The blood flowed down upon his hand from the wounds that had been inflicted, and baptized it—

the word being used to express the simple act of *wetting*, without any reference whatever to mode.

I might have adduced a number of instances in which the word is applied to the process of *dyeing* the hair, the act of personal *ablution*, &c.; but I must content myself with adding three other examples of its use—two from the Septuagint, and one from the New Testament.

8, 9. Daniel iv. 33; v. 21: Nebuchadnezzar "was driven from men, and did eat grass as oxen, and his body *was wet* (*ebaphe*) with the dew of heaven." The terms are exactly the same in both passages. The preposition with which *bapto* is here construed is "*apo*," which, in Matt. iii. 16, and Mark i. 10, our Baptist brethren contend should be rendered "*out of*," to suit the theory of immersion. Here, however, the theory requires a rendering the directly opposite of that, and they now demand that we should translate it "*into*," or "*in*," the dew.

It is amazing what an amount of time and ingenuity has been wasted in the vain endeavour to make these passages speak what they do not mean. I may safely appeal to every candid judgment, whether their natural, obvious meaning be not, that the heavy dews of that country, like those "that descended upon the mountains of Zion," *fell on* the king, all night long, and wetted, or soaked him? Here, again, the word *bapto*, as in my seventh example, is used to express the simple idea of wetting, without any reference to the mode in which it is performed. Dr. Gale admits this, insisting only that he was "*as wet as though he had been dipped*." But immersion is not simply a thorough wetting, but wetting in a particular mode. My objection to it lies in *that*, not in the quantity of water used, or to the entire, instead of the partial wetting of the person of the baptized; for, while I regard a very little water as sufficient, I am willing to use a basin-full, or more, if it be desired.

Dr. Carson's theory of explanation is really very obscure. He has either "darkened counsel by words without knowledge," or his remarks are by far too profound for ordinary minds. He first admits that "the term *wet* gives the general sense of the passage well enough," yet objects to its being so rendered. He then translates it, "his body was *immersed* in the dew," but yet acknowledges that there was no literal immersion. Then calls Dr. Gale's exposition of it absurd, and further on says, "If we would fairly meet this passage,"—an expression that seems to imply that *it meets them*,—"we must shew, not merely that

Nebuchadnezzar was completely wetted, but that a wetting in one mode may be figuratively designated by the words that properly denote a wetting in another mode." And then, after rejecting Dr. Cox's explanation of the difficulty, who thinks that *bapto*, in these instances, is used to denote, *not the mode* by which the body of the king was wetted, but its condition of "*wetness*"—a concession as broad as anything that we can wish,—he begs the whole question by saying, "Whatever may be the principle on which this wetting of Nebuchadnezzar is called immersion, immersion it is called." But is this "fairly meeting the passage?" Is this the enlightened criticism Dr. Carson says so much about? Has he *untied* the Gordian knot, or has he *cut* it? It seems to us that his explanation only weakens his case; for if "a wetting in one mode (*i. e.*, by the falling dew) may be *figuratively* designated by words that properly denote a wetting in another mode," (*i. e.*, by immersion), may not *baptizo*, even if it mean immerse only, have this *figurative* sense, when applied to Christian baptism? If Nebuchadnezzar was baptized, or immersed figuratively, by falling dew, why may we not be baptized, or immersed figuratively, by falling water?

One thing Dr. Carson has established beyond all dispute, and that is, that the passage in question has very greatly perplexed Baptist writers, who, so far at least, appear to be as far from agreeing among themselves concerning it, as they are from satisfying their Pædo-baptist brethren.

10. Rev. xix. 13: "He was clothed with a vesture *dipped* (*bebammenon*) in blood." Now, observe, the Saviour is represented as a warrior riding, on horseback, through the battle-field, with his outer garment *baptized* with, or, according to Baptist phrase, *immersed in*, the blood of the slain. It is true, Dr. Carson tries to explain away the difficulty by asserting that the "vesture dipped in blood" was only "a vesture of a red or purple colour;" but the obvious meaning of the passage,—that which would strike ninety-nine out of every hundred readers,—is, substantially, that conveyed by our English translation. An exact parallel to this language will be found in Isa. lxiii. 2, 3: "Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, &c.? I have trodden the wine-press alone, and of the people there was none with me: for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury; and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment." That is, as the juice of the grapes when trodden in a wine-press, spirted upon the garments of him that trod them, so

the blood of his enemies should bespatter his garments. We are quite aware of the different reading in the Septuagint; but the authority of the Hebrew is so much superior to it, that we cannot stay to consider it. The explanation which is thus afforded is simple and natural, while no one can entertain the idea of an immersion in blood without shrinking and horror. To imagine such a thing, we must suppose the triumphant Saviour to be unhorsed, and plunged, vesture and all, into the reeking blood of the battle-field; for in no other way could the immersion be performed.

Here, then, are *ten* instances in which *bapto* cannot signify to immerse, which, together with the *twenty-one* instances referred to under *baptizo*, make a band of *thirty-one witnesses* against the correctness of Dr. Carson's position, and not his alone, but that of the whole Baptist body.

Should any one take exception to these last examples, as not affecting the question in hand, because *baptizo* is the word employed in the New Testament, to designate the act of Christian baptism, and not *bapto*, I must be permitted to remind them of Dr. Carson's statement, that, "as to totality of immersion, the one is perfectly equivalent to the other." Assuming the correctness of his opinion, Baptist writers constantly argue from one to the other, and attempt to prove the obligation of their mode of baptism, from the meaning of *bapto* in certain cases. Indeed, Carson quotes *bapto* much more frequently than *baptizo*. Hence, if I have shown that *bapto* does not always signify immerse, I have also shown the same of *baptizo*, which is what I undertook to prove.

It is worthy of mention that in the Syriac version of the New Testament, made probably in the first, or very early in the second century, the word *baptizo* is invariably rendered *amad*, the signification of which, before being so employed, was, *to stand*, expressive probably of the *posture* in which the ordinance of baptism was received, as well as of the decision of the individual who received it to serve God. Now, if immersion had then been the only mode of baptism recognized as valid, we should, without doubt, have found some word employed in speaking of it with that as its exclusive meaning; as, for example, *teba*, which has that invariable signification. It does really seem strange that an act that involves the plunging of an individual backwards into the water, should have been expressed by a word that uniformly signified to stand upright!

But, enough! I am satisfied that the evidence presented

is sufficient to convince all who are open to conviction. I will, therefore, sum up this part of my argument with the testimony of three or four eminent authorities, and commend it to your candid consideration.

Dr. Henderson, one of the editors in the employ of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and, indisputably, one of the most learned men of the age, says, "I have not fallen in with a single instance in which it (*baptizo*) can be satisfactorily proved that it signifies the submersion of the whole body, without, at the same time, conveying the idea that the submersion was permanent; that is, that the body *sunk to rise no more.*"

Dr. Owen, a man of profound learning, says, "No instance can be given from Scripture where *baptizo* necessarily means to dip or plunge."

Dr. Dwight, after having examined almost one hundred instances of their occurrence in the New Testament, came to the following conclusion, among others (see his 159th sermon):—"That these words, (*bapto* and *baptizo,*) although often capable of denoting *any* mode of washing, whether by affusion, sprinkling, or immersion, (since cleansing was familiarly accomplished by the Jews in all these ways,) yet in many instances, cannot, without obvious impropriety, be made to signify immersion, and in others, cannot signify it at all."

Albert Barnes, the commentator, says, on Matt. iii. 6, "It cannot be proved from an examination of the passages in the Old and New Testaments, that the idea of a complete immersion *ever* was connected with the word, or that it *ever*, in any case, occurred."

Perhaps some one, in a moment of anguish, may turn round, and say, "Well, but immerse is its *primary* meaning." Unhappy man! he has made shipwreck of his case, for the Baptist theory demands that it be allowed to have only *one* meaning, and hence to speak of a *primary* meaning is to give up the point in dispute. The primary meaning of *deipnon* (the word used to designate the eucharist) is *supper, a full meal;* yet Paul applies it to the mouthful of bread, and the sip of wine, taken at the Lord's table. And reasoning from analogy, if immerse be only *one* of the meanings of *baptizo,*—its *primary* meaning, we will suppose,—who shall say that it is not employed in some *secondary* sense when it refers to baptism? Why may *it* not have a special sense, as well as *deipnon,* and indicate the application of a *little* water, just as *deipnon* indicates the use of a *little* food? The cases are precisely alike, and

hence, any admission, or proof of a secondary meaning to *baptizo*, in our opinion, undermines the entire fabric of immersion.

But we must now hurriedly glance at,

IV. Some of the more prominent objections to which the hypothesis of immersion is liable. The first is,

1. That while Christianity is adapted to all countries and climates, immersion is not. In many countries it would be totally unsuitable, and even highly dangerous to health and life; while in some it would be next to impossible to administer it. In many parts of Asia, and central Africa, for instance, where water is so scarce as to be difficult to procure it in sufficient quantities for the ordinary purposes of life, Christian baptism could not be performed at all, were immersion the only valid mode.

Then as to climate and season: with winters as rigorous as the last, what delicate female could be immersed in the Grand River, except in the warmer months of summer and autumn, without leaping into the very jaws of death? I know of one case in which a lady, a Baptist in principle, wisely declined, on the ground of her delicate state of health, to expose herself to such an ordeal. And if I am correctly informed, a young lady was recently immersed in Paris, C. W., in the winter season, and died shortly afterwards from the effects of it; and her father, after listening to the funeral sermon, preached on the occasion, in which the minister had remarked upon the mysteriousness of Divine Providence in cutting off one so young and promising, rose and publicly charged him with the death of his daughter! Is this, then, the only baptism the New Testament acknowledges? I am aware that our Baptist brethren make very merry over such difficulties, and usually reply to them by joking us on our want of faith, or our dread of the water; but objections like these are not to be sneered at, but met. It will be time enough for our friends to joke when Greenland shall become temperate, and the Great Sahara a well watered garden: till then the objections urged are likely to hold good.

2. My second objection is founded on several incidental references to baptism, in the Acts of the Apostles, two of which I must name.

(*a*) Acts x. 47:—"Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, &c.?" This was the first instance in which the ordinance was administered to Gentile converts, and so great did the innovation appear to the Jewish

brethren, that Peter was called upon to explain his course. Accordingly, he "rehearsed the matter from the beginning," (chap. xi. 4–17.)—the vision, its interpretation, his preaching, and the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them; arguing, that as God had given them the heavenly baptism, he dare not refuse them its divinely appointed symbol.

It is, however, to the terms of the question contained in the 47th verse that I wish to draw your special attention:—"Can any man forbid water?" &c. What construction would the plain, unbiassed reader put upon these words? Would he not think that the Apostle meant them to *bring* him some water that he might baptize them? So, at least, Barnes, Doddridge, Whitby, and Bloomfield, understand it. Barnes says, "The expression here used is one that would naturally refer to water being *brought*,—that is, to a small quantity,—and would seem to imply that they were baptized, not by *immersion*, but by *pouring or sprinkling*." Doddridge says, "It seems most natural to understand it, (as Dr. Whitby does,) 'Who can forbid that water should be brought?' In which view of the clause, one would naturally conclude that they were baptized by *pouring* water *upon them*, rather than by *plunging* them in it." Dr. Bloomfield says, "It would seem to point to water being brought by the hand, and consequently imply that they were baptized, *not by immersion*, but by *affusion*." Dr. Carson seems to think the less said about it the better, as he barely names the objection, and replies, *in four lines*, by telling us, that the water being brought, (which he seems to admit,) affects not the question, and asks, "Must the observance of the ordinances of Christ, never put us to trouble?" Trouble, indeed! for there seems to have been a houseful to baptize, and it would have required no small quantity of water to do it. A strange sequel, truly,—the hurrying to and fro of the servants with their leathern water-bottles,—to the solemn scene they had just witnessed in the baptism of the Holy Ghost!

But follow out such a supposition to its legitimate conclusions, and to what will it lead us? Where were these believers immersed? Clearly, in the room in which they were assembled, if anywhere. Then, of course, the room must have afforded conveniences for so doing. Peter asks for *water* only, not for a *bath;* with that, and all the other indispensables of immersion, we must conclude it was already provided. And where could such conveniences be found, except in the bath-room—if there was one? Hence, on the supposition of immersion in this case, we are forced

to the conclusion that Cornelius had invited all "his kinsmen and near friends" to meet the Apostle in the *bath-room* of his house, and there to hold their solemn religious services!

(*b*) Similar difficulty exists in relation to the baptism of the Jailor and his family, recorded in Acts xvi. 33. The narrative is simple and natural when understood to refer to our mode of baptism, but requires a great deal of humoring before it will consent to lend any countenance to immersion. He "was baptized, he and all his, straightway;" *i. e.*, immediately, in the prison,—as soon as he had "washed the stripes" of the Apostles, and probably with a portion of the water that had been brought for that purpose. He had "brought them out" of the "*inner prison*," into which he had thrust them, (v. 24) but had not yet "brought them into his house"—his own apartments—(v. 34).

The difficulty lies in finding conveniences for an immersion in a Roman prison, so speedily, and at such an hour of the night. Baptist writers could not fail to observe this, and have laboured most ingenicusly and assiduously to overcome it. One supposes the prison to have been provided with a *bath;* another, regarding that, perhaps, as more than doubtful, reminds us of the *river* at Philippi, at the side of which the disciples had probably met, the day before, for religious worship, and thinks it more likely that it was performed there; a third, remembering that it would be as much as the jailor's life was worth for him, and his family, to leave the prisoners at such an hour, and in such a way, inclines to the belief that it was accomplished in one of the *tanks*, or *cisterns*, with which, he assures us, Philippi abounded; and a fourth brings up the rear with the oracular statement that "there *might* have been a *thousand* ways of obtaining water of which we are ignorant," and then closes with the following beautiful syllogism, which, on account of its force and conciseness, I must present *verbatim*:—"The jailor and his household were *baptized, therefore*, they were *immersed!** It must be a very poor case, indeed, that can require such logic as that.

Hitherto, at least, all the conjectures that have been hazarded on this case have left the difficulty as great as ever; and, in our opinion, nothing that can be written upon it can ever materially lessen it; for "that which is crooked cannot be made straight, and that which is wanting cannot be numbered."

---

* Carson; page 203.

3. My third objection regards the baptism of John; and here entirely new difficulties surround the theory of immersion. Now observe, first,

(*a*) The immense multitudes that were baptized by John. It is said in Matt. iii, 5: "There went out to him *Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan*, and were baptized of him in Jordan," &c. What number of persons, then, would that expression fairly represent? Why, without a doubt, more than all Canada contains, from Sarnia to Gaspé. Eleven hundred thousands perished in Jerusalem alone, at its destruction, a few years later than this, after all the Christians had fled from it, as instructed by the Saviour; and they probably numbered several hundred thousands. Josephus tells us that three millions of persons were present at the Feast of the Passover, about thirty-five years after the death of Christ; how many were *not* present we have no means of knowing. *Three millions*, however, may be taken as a moderate estimate of the population of the places and region named. Of these we will suppose that *one sixth* went out to hear John, and were baptized,—a very moderate estimate, again, when it is said that "*all* the people" were baptized of him,—and we have thus *half a million* as the basis of our calculation. Perhaps it may aid you in conceiving of so vast a number, to say that, marching six a-breast, they would form a procession over forty-seven miles in length. Such was John's company. Observe, secondly,

(*b*) The time occupied in baptizing them. As nearly as can be computed, it was accomplished in *six months*, and the mode of computation is as follows:—John was just six months older than Jesus, (Luke i. 26, 36); hence when he baptized Jesus, (*after* "all the people were baptized," Luke iii. 21), he must have been thirty years and six months of age, since Jesus was "about thirty years of age" (iii. 23) at his baptism. Now, by a reference to Numbers iv. 3, 47, you will find that Jewish priests did not enter upon the duties of their sacred office till they had arrived at thirty years of age. Jesus himself conformed to that rule, as he did not enter upon his ministry till after his baptism; and there can be no doubt that John, the son of a Jewish priest, did not begin his work until he was of the age required. He thus had only six months in which to baptize half a million of people. Observe, thirdly,

(*c*) He exercised no miraculous power in baptizing them, and received, probably, no human assistance. "John did no miracle," (John x. 41); and hence he had to rely on

merely human strength, and powers of endurance. It is recorded of Jesus, that "he himself baptized not, but his disciples," (John iv. 2), but no such statement is made respecting John: the presumption, therefore, is, that he alone baptized.

Now let us set him to his task. He has half a million to immerse; he has six months, *minus* the time occupied in preaching, to do it in; and has nothing beyond human strength to depend upon. He immerses 200 the first day,—a larger number than I have ever heard of being immersed in one day, by one administrator,—but at that rate, with no allowance for Sabbath rest, it will take him nearly *seven years!* He increases the number to 500; but even at the rate of 500 *per diem*, he will require nearly *three* years. Nothing less than 2770 a day, will suffice, if he would accomplish his task within the specified time! Now, I ask, is it credible that John *immersed* his converts at that rate, and for that length of time together? Remember, that great physical strength, as well as time, is required to immerse any considerable number, in immediate succession. The person of each will weigh, on an average, 120 lbs., on emerging from the water, almost the entire weight of which has to be lifted by the administrator. The labour of immersing one hundred persons would, therefore, be equal, in the aggregate, to raising a weight of six tons; but if John immersed 2770 *per diem*, he must have performed the Herculean task of lifting 165 tons daily, or what would be equal to the unlading of a small ship, and that for six months in succession!

Moreover, it would not have been possible for him to have endured the action of the water upon his lower extremities during that period of time. His flesh would literally have rotted from off his bones, long before his task could have been fulfilled. Mackintosh dresses are the invention of a later age.

Now, I am not to be frightened by Dr. Carson's oft-repeated cry of "heresy," "blasphemy," &c., into his conclusion—"They were baptized, therefore, they were immersed." *My* conclusion, in view of the foregoing considerations, is the directly opposite of his,—"They were baptized, therefore, they were *not* immersed." Which is most reasonable?

I might add, fourthly,

(*d*) Difficulties, equally great, attend the hypothesis of immersion, as respects the *clothing* of the people. One or other of three things is certain:—either they were baptized

in their ordinary dress, and left the stream, dripping, and thus went to their homes, some of which must have been many miles distant; or, they were furnished with baptizing habits, in which case they would sadly need the modern luxury of robing-rooms; or, they were immersed in a state of nudity, which would have been preposterous.

Concerning all these difficulties connected with John's baptism, Dr. Carson is wisely silent: we suppose he knew his case too well to meddle with them. He fails not, however, to remind us that John baptized "in Ænon, near to Salem, because there was much water there;" in reply to which I must content myself with offering two or three observations. In the first place, the original will bear, equally well, the rendering, "*many* waters," that being, in fact, the more *literal* translation of the two. The name Ænon signifies "*springs*," and was, no doubt, given to the locality, "because there were *many springs* there." Secondly, the fact that John was everywhere followed by so large a company, would naturally lead him to select a spot with the requisite accommodation for them; and as many of them must have come from a distance, with their camels or asses, an abundant supply of water would be essential. Like Paul, he was sent to *preach*, rather than to *baptize;* to lead men to repentance, and not merely to immerse them. Hence his first thought would be to locate himself in some place that would be suitable for his great "field-meeting," so that all might come who desired to do so. This, we cannot but regard as a much better reason for John's choice of Ænon than that usually assumed by Baptists to have been the one that influenced him. The *Apostles* found water in abundance *everywhere* for their baptisms,—in the temple, in houses, in deserts, in jails, and where not?—but *John* had to travel to *Ænon* to find enough for *his!* This certainly needs explanation.

I had intended, had time permitted, to have shown the difficulties attending the supposition that the 3000 converted at Pentecost were immersed,—arising from the want of time, the absence of conveniences for such a purpose in the temple, and the utter improbability that the Apostles would have been allowed to use them, even had they existed; but several similar points of difficulty having been already discussed, in my second and third objections, I omit further reference to them, and shall bring my lecture to a close by a very brief epitome of the early

HISTORICAL EVIDENCE

upon the mode of baptism.

The allusions to it in the records of the Christian church for the first three or four centuries, are few in number, and often somewhat obscure, there having been no controversy during that period, in relation to either the proper subjects of the rite, or the mode of administering it. The following, however, may be regarded as reliable:—

Justin Martyr—about A. D. 160—speaks of Christians as being "*washed with water*, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost;" and calls the heathen *sprinklings* "an imitation of *the true baptism.*"

Tertullian—A.D. 190–220—usually employs "*tingo*" as the Latin representative of "*baptizo*," rendered by Ainsworth—1. To dye, colour, stain; 2. to sprinkle, imbrue; 3. to wash; 4. to paint. He sometimes uses "*mergo*," also, to merge or dip; but never "*submergo*," the equivalent of *immerse.* The same writer speaks of Christ *pouring water* on his disciples' feet as *a baptism*, which Peter refused.

Origen—A.D. 185—speaks of Elijah's sacrifice being *baptized*,—an allusion to an act which you all know was performed by pouring water upon it, in great quantities. 1 Kings, xviii. 33.

Laurentius—A.D. 250—is said to have *baptized* several persons with water, which he *poured out of a pitcher*—one of them his executioner.

Lactantius, his cotemporary, calls Christ's baptism a *perfusion.*

Cyprian—A.D. 250—and Jerome, somewhat later, understood Ezek. xxxvi. 25: "I will *sprinkle* clean water upon you," &c., as referring to Christian baptism.

A Council, called A.D. 313, recognized *clinical* baptism, *i. e.*, baptism upon a bed, in case of sickness, as *valid.*

Athanasius—A.D. 350—speaks of baptism performed by *sprinkling;* so does the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 364; and so does Gregory Nazianzen, A.D. 370. And lastly,

Augustin—A.D. 380—tells us, "The person to be baptized is either *sprinkled* with water, or dipped in it,"

The Baptisteries in use, moreover, were, many of them, so small that they could not have admitted of immersion. One of these, still to be seen in the Catacomb of Pontianus, and constructed probably as early as *the beginning of the second century*—possibly, earlier still—is described as being about *two feet in depth*, and the same *in width.* In the absence of a regular baptistery, family baths, capable of containing only about twenty gallons of water, were often used—in *capacity* far too small for immersion, and of a *shape* that rendered it utterly impossible. Furthermore,

Ancient carvings and representations of the baptism of our Lord, some of them executed as early as A.D. 400, and still extant, uniformly represent him as standing in the water, while John Baptist pours water upon his head. Such a mode will account for the apparent contradiction between different writers on this subject; *going into the water* being quite compatible with a subsequent baptism *by affusion.*

As far, therefore, as we can judge, the practice of the churches in the third and fourth centuries seems to have been, first, to wash the body of the candidate all over, (which in the case of females was performed by an order of Deaconesses,) and afterwards to administer baptism,—the candidate *standing in water* to the depth of two feet or more, while the minister (who stood, *not in the water or baptistery, at all*, but on the edge of it) *poured water on his head. Immersion* may have been one of the modes of baptism in the fourth century, and doubtless was, and so was *trine immersion*, and probably immersion *in a state of nudity* also; but all history shows that it was not the *only* mode. And with so manifest a tendency in the early churches to multiply forms, and to abandon those more *simple* for those more *showy*, it is much more likely, to say the least, that *immersion was the innovation*, and not *sprinkling or pouring.*

LECTURE IV.

INFANT BAPTISM.

Acts xvi. 15:—"*And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, if ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there. And she constrained us.*"

The question to be discussed in the present Lecture is, whether the word of God affords a sufficient warrant for the baptism of the infant children of believers, on the ground of the faith of their parents? Before proceeding to its discussion, however, we must be permitted to offer three preliminary observations:—

1. The question now to engage our attention, *is totally distinct* from the one that has occupied it during the last two lectures. There is no kind of connection between them, except such as is derived from the *custom* of associating them together. It by no means follows that a man must reject the practice of Infant Baptism, if he should fail to see what he thinks sufficient evidence for baptism by pouring, or sprinkling; nor does it follow, on the other hand, that he must embrace the theory of immersion, because he fails to see what he regards as sufficient scriptural authority for the baptism of infants. Let this be kept distinctly in view; it is often overlooked.

2. We must, at the outset, deny our opponents the right to prescribe the *kind* of evidence that we may use in the discussion of this question, or the *sources* whence we may derive it. The obedient child will run to do his father's bidding, in whatever way his will has been made known, whether by *look*, or *signal*, or *word*. So the disciple of Christ will not be disposed to ask whether his Lord has made known his will *in so many words*, but whether he has given him intimation of it *in any shape*. Our Baptist brethren often ask us, with an air of triumph, to produce one positive command in the New Testament to baptize infants, and we reply, just as broadly as any of them could desire, *we cannot!* We will give them the *look*, the *signal*, but not the *word* of Christ; for our Lord, in this instance, has not thought it needful to add positive command to the various other methods he has left us of arriving at a know-

ledge of his will, in this particular. Let no one, therefore, jump at hasty conclusions, because of the admission I have made. The scripturalness of infant baptism does not depend, for a moment, on positive command. It rests on precisely the same ground with the observance of the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath; and the blow that strikes at the one, because it is not specifically enjoined upon us, tells with equal effect upon the other. Both depend upon *inference;* neither has the support of a single *positive command.* Consistency, therefore, would require of our Baptist brethren, either that they return to the observance of the *Jewish* Sabbath, as the Seventh-day Baptists,—driven to it, we venture to say, by this very principle,—have done; or else, that they cease to oppose infant baptism on the ground referred to. And, by the way, the same flimsy objection might be shown to interfere sadly with their practice of *close communion;* for, whatever their *New* Version of the New Testament may do for them, our *old* version certainly contains *not one* positive command to exclude unbaptized brethren, (even if we *are* unbaptized,) from the Lord's table.

3. We have no dispute with Baptists as to adult baptism; here we are at one. *We* believe, as well as *they*, that a profession of faith is necessary before we can baptize an adult. We always require evidence of conversion in such a case. We may add, moreover, that if infant baptism were confined, as we think it should be, to the children of believing parents, the cases of adult baptism among Pædobaptists, would be much more numerous than they are.

We come now to the question before us, and shall first present, as briefly and lucidly as possible, the argument from the Abrahamic covenant. The successive steps of the argument may be concisely stated, in anticipation, as follows:—God entered into covenant with Abraham;—that covenant plainly comprehended spiritual, as well as temporal blessings, and formed the basis of the ancient church;—the seal of that covenant was circumcision, which was applied, not only to Abraham, but to his children, on the ground of his faith;—that covenant, fulfilled as to its *temporal* conditions, is confirmed as to its *spiritual* conditions, with the spiritual seed of Abraham, under the New Testament economy, with the simple change of the seal from circumcision to baptism; and hence, we conclude, in the absence of any prohibition, that as the children of members of the *Patriarchal* and *Jewish* churches were circumcised, on the faith of *their* parents, so the children of

members of the *Christian* church should be baptized, on the faith of *their* parents. These several positions I shall endeavour to establish, in the order in which they have been named.

I. God entered into a covenant with Abraham, which, in its amplest form, is recorded in Genesis xvii. 4-14, by which He bound himself to bestow certain blessings upon Abraham and his seed for ever. The condition on which these blessings were to be bestowed was, the circumcision of Abraham and all his male children. Circumcision was, therefore, the *seal* of that covenant, without which neither he, nor any of his descendants, could have laid any claim to its fulfilment. With this condition Abraham complied. "He was circumcised, and Ishmael his son, and all the men of his house;" (vs. 23-27.) the latter receiving the seal of the covenant, exclusively on the ground of their relationship to Abraham, their father, and master. So it continued to be applied, through all the subsequent generations of his family, until the coming of Christ,—circumcision on the eighth day having been uniformly practised among the Jews.

II. This covenant plainly comprehended *spiritual*, as well as *temporal* blessings. The following are some of its terms:—

1. "Thou shalt be a father of many nations," (Gen. xvii. 4); *i. e.*, not of the Jewish nation only,—his natural seed,—but of many nations,—a spiritual seed. Paul tells us that "he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised; that he might be *the father of all them that believe*, though they be uncircumcised." Rom. iv. 11. And again, "If ye be Christ's, then are ye—Galatians, Gentiles, though ye be—*Abraham's seed*, and heirs according to the promise." Gal. iii. 29. But of what promise were they heirs? Of Canaan? Assuredly not, for that was the heritage of the Jewish nation, exclusively; but heirs of the *spiritual* blessings promised; for "we which are of faith—believers—are blessed with faithful Abraham." Gal. iii. 9.

2. "Thou shalt be a blessing," (Gen. xii. 2), "and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed," (xii. 3, and xxii. 18.) In "*thy seed*, which is *Christ*," says the Apostle. (Gal. iii. 16.) The inspired interpretation of this promise is, therefore, that he should be the honoured

progenitor of the Saviour, and that, in Him, all nations should be blessed with the knowledge of salvation. Surely this was a promise of *spiritual* good.

3. "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." Gen. xvii. 7. Remember that Paul explains this of the spiritual seed of Abraham—believers—to whatever nation they may belong, Jewish or Gentile. Can any one doubt that this is a promise of *spiritual* blessings? When David exclaims, "God, even our own God, shall bless us," does he contemplate *temporal* good only, or even chiefly? Surely not; nor could Abraham, at least equally eminent for holiness, so mistake the nature of this promise, as to suppose it to refer to any mere worldly advantage.

4. But even that part of the covenant that secures to the natural seed of Abraham, "the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession," (Gen. xvii. 8,) points, probably, to a heavenly inheritance, as well as to an earthly one. Paul writes of the earthly Canaan, (Heb. xi. 13–16,) as a familiar type of "a better country, that is, a heavenly," to which Abraham, among others, looked forward with such longing anticipations. Of course, only his spiritual seed, whether Jews or Gentiles, could expect the heavenly inheritance, inasmuch as all the spiritual blessings of the covenant depended on the exercise of faith; but that it was included, and understood, we think there can be no reasonable doubt, since there is no other mention made of it to Abraham.

But even were there no such allusion as we have supposed to exist, in the promise of the land of Canaan, God's avowed object in bestowing it upon them, was the preservation, among them and through them, as a separated people, of the knowledge of his name. So that even Canaan was a spiritual blessing, in disguise. It is most manifest, therefore, that not only was this covenant *not* one of *carnal things* exclusively, but that *every article* of it secured some *spiritual good.*

To escape the force of this conclusion, our Baptist brethren have had recourse to two theories of explanation. Some of them allege that there were two distinct covenants, one of spiritual blessings, and the other of temporal blessings; and that to the latter alone the seal of circumcision was attached. Others, again, fancy that each separate appearance of God to Abraham, recorded in the 12th, 15th, 17th, and 22nd chapters of Genesis, was accompanied by

its own particular covenant, instead of a repetition of the same covenant differing only in detail.

But unfortunately for both these theories, the seal of circumcision was attached to the fullest of all four statements of the covenant,—that in Gen. xvii,—the one which contains the first, third, and fourth of the promises we have examined. Moreover, every covenant must have its seal; but where is the seal of the *spiritual* covenant, if circumcision belongs to the *temporal* covenant alone? Neither of these hypotheses has the shadow of probability to support it, and no one would ever have thought of them, had it not been for the desire to invalidate the argument for infant baptism, drawn from the source referred to.

III. The establishment of this covenant with Abraham was the origin of the Church of God, in its organized form. There had been myriads of godly men and women, doubtless, before this, but never any church organization. God now constitutes one, in the family of his servant Abraham, and names the terms of admission into it,—"Every man-child shall be circumcised,"—and Abraham himself receives the initiatory rite. The church thus organized in this favoured household, grew with its growth, until in the family of Jacob it went down into Egypt. There it continued 430 years, oppressed by the Egyptians, after which God brought it "out of the house of bondage," by the hand of Moses, by which time it had become a nation. We need not trace its history farther, except to say that the covenant, on the basis of which it was constituted, continued in full force until the Angel of the Covenant—the Lord from heaven—appeared, and, as we think we can show, extended its provisions, and changed its seal to baptism.

IV. This covenant established a religious connection between the believing parent and his child, and thus, between the church of God, and the children of his people. The initiatory rite of circumcision was to be performed in infancy,—"on the eighth day,"—and solely on the ground of the faith of the parent. From this rule there was to be no deviation, so that *adult* circumcision was a thing unknown to the Jews, except on the admission of a proselyte into the church, and must have been a much less frequent occurrence with them, than *adult baptism* is with us. The infant Jew, therefore, stood in a relationship to the Church of God, in which no other child could stand, without the application of the divinely-appointed rite. He did not,—

he could not, from his tender age,—enjoy the full connection in which his parents stood. He was not expected to attend the solemn feasts of Israel until he was twelve years old; but still circumcision at once established a visible and recognized connection with the church of God, fraught with spiritual benefit to the child; otherwise, the threat attending the neglect of it—"that soul shall be cut off from his people"—could have brought no terror with it.

V. This covenant is confirmed with the spiritual seed of Abraham, under the Christian dispensation, and still exists. Every true believer in the Lord Jesus Christ may lay an humble claim, for himself and for his children, to all the spiritual blessings it promises, This will be made apparent by the following considerations:—

1. It is called "an *everlasting* covenant;" hence, we might expect its continuance to the end of time, unless abrogated by Him who first established it.

2. We have no account of such abrogation. The Mosaic economy is explicitly said to have passed away; but this covenant, like the Sabbath, not owing its origin to that economy, did not expire with it. Paul distinctly affirms that the law "could not disannul it." Gal. iii. 17. Our Baptist brethren totally mistake its character, therefore, when they speak of it, or of circumcision, as Jewish. The Saviour tells us expressly, that it was "not of Moses, but of the fathers." John vii. 22.

3. The covenant is distinctly said to have been "*confirmed* of God in Christ," (Gal. iii. 17); and Jesus Christ is said to have been "a minister of the circumcision, (*i. e.*, preached chiefly to Jews,) for the truth of God, to *confirm* the promises made unto the fathers." Rom. xv. 8. And

4. The terms of the covenant itself require its continuance, in order to its complete fulfilment. "In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Now this could not have been fulfilled before the calling of the Gentiles. They were *not* blessed with the knowledge of salvation while the Jewish economy lasted: it was requisite, therefore, that the covenant should continue, till they were brought in to participate in its blessings, as the spiritual seed of Abraham.

If it should be objected to this view, that God promised, by the prophet Jeremiah, (xxxi. 31) to make "a *new* covenant" with Israel; we reply, that the *new* covenant was not to take the place of the Abrahamic, but of the Sinaitic covenant. See Paul's exposition of it, Heb. viii. 13. There

is, indeed, a very striking likeness between some of the terms of the new covenant promised, and those of the Abrahamic; so that the passage quoted as an objection, is wholly in our favour.

VI. The seal of this covenant has been changed, under the Christian dispensation, from circumcision to baptism.

In proof of this I remark,

1. That both were divinely appointed as rites of initiation into the Church of God.

2. Both have ascribed to them the same significacy—that of purification. That baptism had this signification all admit; and that circumcision had also, is clear from such expressions as the following:—"Circumcise the foreskin of your heart;" (Deut. x. 16:) "Ye uncircumcised in heart and ears;" (Acts, vii. 51:) "Circumcision is that of the heart." (Rom. ii. 29.)

3. Both signified the adherence of the parties receiving them, to the covenant of which they were the seals. Here some Baptist brother, lying in wait for me, will smile at the idea of an infant covenanting with God in baptism. And so he may, for such a thing is impossible. But if he will bear in mind that the covenant is *between God and the parent*, on behalf of the child for whom he asks the baptismal seal, the difficulty will vanish at once. It can be no greater, at any rate, in the *baptism*, than it was formerly in the *circumcision* of a child.

4. Baptism bears the same relationship to the Lord's supper, that circumcision did to the Passover. Each economy has had its two standing institutions. At the decay of Judaism, the Passover was superceded by the Lord's supper,—an ordinance of similar import, but more in accordance with the simplicity of everything pertaining to Christianity. Then by what has circumcision been superceded, if not by baptism? And since baptism teaches us, in a simpler way, the same truth as circumcision, does it not look a little like avoiding an unpleasant conclusion, to deny that it has taken its place, lest the next inference should be irresistible,—that as circumcision was administered to parents and their children, so should baptism? And,

5. Baptism is distinctly declared to be the Christian circumcision, in Col. ii. 11, 12; "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, *by the circumcision of Christ:* buried with him in baptism," &c. The beginning of v. 12 clearly explains the closing sentence of

v. 11: and this view of the passage is confirmed by the language of Peter, (1 Epist. iii. 21) who speaks of baptism as "the putting away of the filth of the flesh,"—an expression very closely resembling that used by Paul, in the quotation referred to.

The obvious inference from all this, is,

VII. That in the absence of any positive prohibition of infant baptism, in the New Testament, we are fully authorized, nay required, to administer baptism to parents and their children, just as circumcision was administered. The absence of positive command to do so, is not only no argument against it, but is, on the contrary, precisely what we should expect from the continuance of the covenant, with the simple change of the seal.

The case, in our judgment, stands thus:—God says to his ancient people, "I establish a covenant with you, to be continued throughout all generations, by virtue of which I regard myself as pledged to the bestowment of certain blessings, the condition being that you signify your adherence to it by submitting to the bloody rite of circumcision. Be careful to *circumcise your children*, as well as yourselves." After about 2000 years, during which this requirement had been rigidly adhered to, God speaks again, and says, "I relieve you from the bloody rite you have hitherto received: henceforth, instead of being circumcised, you shall be baptized." Now, although in this change children are not expressly required to be baptized, must we not conclude, in the absence of any prohibition, that as nothing but the *rite* is said to be changed, the children who were *circumcised* with their parents before, are to be *baptized* with their parents now? To my own mind nothing can be plainer. The Apostles, as Jews, accustomed to see circumcision administered to the children of proselytes along with their parents, and regarding baptism as having taken its place, would naturally conclude, in the absence of express countermand from Christ, that they were to apply the *new seal*, as the *old* one had been applied. Had the commission read, "Go, teach all nations, *circumcising* them," &c., no one would have doubted for a moment that our Lord intended Gentile children to enjoy the privilege of a visible connection with the people of God, through their parents, as Jewish children had done before them. The household baptisms of the New Testament, would then have been household circumcisions; and no one would have questioned the presence of children in these house-

holds, or the application of the rite to them, any more than in the re-circumcising of the children of Israel, recorded in the 5th chapter of Joshua. Where, then, is the ground for doubt as to the presence of children, or their baptism with their parents, now that the commission reads, "Go, teach all nations, *baptizing* them," &c?

It is for our Baptist brethren, therefore, to produce some passage of Scripture, in which, by *positive limitation* of the ordinance *to adult converts alone*, children are excluded from receiving it, and not for us to show *positive command* to administer it to them. We have pointed out the statute: let them point out the act of amendment or repeal.

Of the weight of the foregoing conclusions, in the argument for infant baptism, we may judge with tolerable accuracy, by the anxiety of our opponents to overthrow them. What cannot be done by reason, is sometimes attempted by wit. Some of you will remember the introduction to a series of articles that appeared in the *Christian Messenger* a few months since, signed "*Eugenio*," in review of the Rev. W. F. Clarke's essay on "The Divine Covenant and Infant Baptism,"*—"Here comes the Rev. W. F. Clarke, with the Abrahamic covenant on his back; make way for him!" The sole object of the writer, in adopting such a strain of ridicule, must have been to waylay the judgment of the reader by a laugh, and unfit him for serious reflection; or, at any rate, that would be its natural effect in many cases.

Another meets us with some such remark as, "How absurd to go to the Old Testament for proof concerning a New Testament institution!" To which we might with equal reason reply, "How absurd for Paul to quote Old Testament authorities in support of the New Testament economy! Or to adduce Jewish evidence concerning the priesthood of Christ! Paul quoted the writings of the Old Testament to show that the *Mosaic ritual was not* intended to continue: *we* quote the same Scriptures to show that the *Abrahamic covenant was* intended to continue. We are in good company, therefore, and stand on solid ground in appealing to the Old Testament, or else Paul did not. "Besides, if there is, as will be admitted, a universal harmony in the word of God, does it not follow that whatever is established from one part of it, is as really and effectually established as it could have been from any other?" The objection is, therefore, unreasonable, and we cannot but

---

* See *Canadian Independent*, of July 9th and 23rd, 1855.

regard it as calculated to undermine the authority of the Old Testament altogether, and cast suspicion upon its teaching in relation to other points, as well as to the one in hand.

Let no one suppose, however, that we derive our argument for infant baptism from the Old Testament alone, or that the New Testament is silent in relation to it. We admit—if any one is disposed to regard it as an *admission*—that it contains no positive command for its observance, but we do not and cannot admit that it is *silent* respecting it. If our argument has been at all successful, we have shown already, from the New Testament, the continuance of the covenant made with Abraham, without any change except that of its seal; and, consequently, that we should expect *infant* baptism to take the place of *infant* circumcision, just as *adult* baptism has taken the place of *adult circumcision*, and not a single sentence can our Baptist brethren adduce from the New Testament at positive variance with such a conclusion.

We observe,

VIII. That our previous positions receive a striking confirmation from the Apostolic practice of *household baptism*. We say, the *practice* of household baptism, for the several instances of its occurrence must be regarded as exhibiting the practice of the Apostles, rather than as isolated, and perhaps uncommon cases, for the following reasons, to which your special attention is invited:—

1. The four instances placed on record—those of Cornelius and his household, (Acts x. 48); Lydia "and her household," (xvi. 15); the jailer "and all his," (xvi. 33); and "the household of Stephanas," (1 Cor. i. 16),—are mentioned in such an incidental manner as to produce the impression that the baptism of a believer was usually accompanied by the baptism of his family.

2. We have *no instance on record* in the New Testament of the baptism of any one in the presence of his family, *without his family being baptized with him*. This fact we regard as very significant.

3. The *household baptisms* recorded in the New Testament form *one seventh of the entire number* of the baptisms in which the name of the convert is mentioned. The number of converts of whose baptism we have any particular account is twenty-eight. Of these, four were heads of households which were baptized with them, or one in seven. The entire number of *converts* whose *names* are

given is fifty-five, while the number of Christian or baptized *households* named is eight—the latter still bearing the proportion of one in seven to the former. Now if the Book of Acts may be taken as giving us a fair specimen of what was going on constantly, (of which there can be no reasonable doubt,) about *every seventh case of baptism administered by the Apostles was the baptism of the head of a family, and of his or her household.* Carry out this thought in relation to the tens of thousands who were baptized during the period embraced by the inspired narrative, and how many thousands of baptized families will you have!

4. We have *no instance on record in the New Testament, of any child of Christian parents being baptized in adult age, upon making profession of faith,* although the inspired history covers a period of over thirty years after the organization of the first Christian church in Jerusalem. One such instance, could it be found, would do more to overthrow Pædo-baptism than all that has ever been written against it. In Baptist churches the child of Christian parents is baptized, as others are, only *on profession of faith,* and hence, had the New Testament afforded but a single example of the baptism, *in adult age,* of some Timothy, whose mother and grandmother were Christians before him, there would have been some ground for supposing that *they,* at least, did not practise *infant* baptism. But no such example can be produced, and the fact is instructive.

5. The Jews, accustomed to see children associated with their parents in the rite of circumcision, and regarding this visible connection with the people of God as the highest privilege they could confer upon them, would naturally expect their children to be associated with themselves in baptism; and would have murmured, and instituted invidious comparisons between Christianity and Judaism, had their households not been baptized with them. Yet we never read of any murmur of this kind, nor of any such invidious comparisons by Judaizing teachers; and the inference is that there was no ground for it, or in other words, *that the Apostles commonly baptized the believer's household when they baptized the believer himself.* This conclusion we regard as fully established by the instances on record, taken in connection with the foregoing considerations.

IX. *Household* baptism must have involved *infant* baptism. No satisfactory account can be given of it on

Baptist principles. To infer, as Baptists do, in the first place, that there were no infants, or young children, in any of these families, or else that they were not baptized if there were; and, secondly, that all the elder children and adults believed *simultaneously*, is surely *inferring* a little too much, after demanding *positive injunction* of us.

You will observe the nature of the case is such that the evidence, *on either side*, can never amount to anything more than *probability*. We cannot *prove* that there were little children in the households said to have been baptized, nor could we have done so even had there been thousands of household baptisms actually recorded, unless it had been expressly mentioned that in such and such cases there were little children. On the other hand, our Baptist brethren certainly cannot *prove* that there were *none*. We must, therefore, weigh carefully the *probabilities* of the case, and in doing so we think it will appear that while the evidence in support of the Baptist hypothesis amounts to nothing beyond *the barest possibility*, that in support of our's amounts to *everything but demonstration*.

1. Of whatever these households were composed—adults alone, or adults and children—*all connected with them were baptized*. Lydia "was baptized, *and her household;*" and so was the jailer—"*he and all his;*" not, Lydia "and all of her household that *believed*," or, the jailer, "and all the *adult* members of his family." No such term of limitation is employed: the entire household is plainly intended. The same remark applies to the baptism of the households of Cornelius and Stephanas. Hence, *if there were any infants or young children* in these households, *they were baptized* along with their parents.

2. The word "*oikos*"—rendered *house* or *household*, in each of the four instances referred to—properly signifies a *family*, composed of adults and children. The Greek language contains no term equally appropriate, on the supposition that such households were intended. Take an example or two of its use in the Septuagint:—"God setteth the solitary *in families*" (*en oikō*); "He maketh the barren woman to keep *house*" (*en oikō*); "Thy *house* (*oikos*) which the Lord shall give thee of this young woman."* In all these quotations the word certainly includes *infant* children, and no reason whatever can be given for assigning it any other signification when applied to the baptism of households.

---

* Psalm lxviii. 6; cxiii. 9; Ruth iv. 12.

Had the word "*oikia*" been used, our Baptist brethren might have told us, with some degree of plausibility, that the *domestics* were intended, though even then the *children* would not be excluded by the term. But the "*oikos*" was baptized—the family—parents and children—for that is its obvious signification. And this distinction has been carefully observed by the inspired narrator, as will be seen by an examination of vs. 31, 32:—"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy *house* (*oikos*). And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his *house* (*oikia*);" *i. e.*, to his *domestics* also.

To this it may be objected, that the "household of Stephanas," said in 1 Cor. i. 16, to have been baptized, are said in 1 Co. xvi. 15, to have "addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints," and that *they* therefore must have been a household of adult believers. But here again the distinction in the meaning of these two words is carefully observed, for while Paul says he baptized the "*oikos*"—*family*—of Stephanas, it was the "*oikia*"—household, including doubtless some pious domestics—of Stephanas, whose kind offices Paul so courteously acknowledges. The objection, therefore, only helps to establish our position—that "*oikos*" properly signifies *a family*, ordinarily composed of parents and children.

3. Apart from the meaning of the word employed, *the probability is that there were infants, or young children, in some, if not in all, of these baptized households.* Four families could hardly be mentioned promiscuously, as these were, without having young children in some of them. I know it will be said in reply, that there are many households unblessed with children, and many families in which all the children have arrived at adult age; but *many* is a comparative term, for there are *very many more that do* contain children. You can easily put this matter to the test. Sit down, and make out a list of 100 persons, taken promiscuously from the circle of your acquaintances, each of them being a householder, and see what proportion of their households contain young children. I have twice tried the experiment myself, upon lists prepared for an entirely different purpose, and found that 158 households out of 210, contained children under seven years of age, or 3 out of 4! One of the experiments, indeed, made the proportion considerably larger—about 5 out of 6—but I am willing to abide by the lowest result, although I am persuaded that it is far below the actual proportion. You will observe that we are dealing now, not with *probabilities*, but

with *an ascertained fact*—three households out of every four contain young children; and as no valid reason can be given for regarding them as exceptions, the obvious inference is, that three out of the four mentioned in the New Testament as having been baptized, contained young children also.

We must not lose sight of our *eighth* position, however. Hitherto our argument has been based upon the instances of household baptism actually recorded. But we have shown, we think, that these must have been, not isolated cases, but simply illustrations of the Apostles' *practice* in this respect, and that, as far as we can judge from the inspired narrative, whenever the head of a household was baptized, his household was baptized with him. There must have been *thousands* of such cases, therefore, of the particulars of which no record has been left us, just as there were thousands of individual believers baptized, whose names even have not been mentioned. Baptists will call all this conjecture, but to us it is *fact*, as well sustained as anything can be, short of explicit statement, and we cannot say that even explicit statement would strengthen our conviction of its truthfulness. Were all these households, then, composed entirely of *adults?* Or after it has been shown that *all* connected with the four of which we have any account, were baptized—old or young—will any one *assume* that the Apostolic practice in the cases unrecorded was different?

4. The baptism of the households of Lydia and the Jailer, at least, was performed, in each case, *on the ground of the parent's faith*, which is an essential feature of infant baptism. There is nothing, indeed, in either of the other instances *against* such a view, but in those referred to it is clearly in favour of it. *Lydia's* heart was "opened"—"*she* attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul"—"*she* besought" the Apostles to "come into her house and abide there"—and her plea was, "if ye have judged *me* to be faithful," &c. There is not the shadow of proof that any one believed but Lydia, yet when Paul baptized her, he baptized her household also.

To suppose the household of this "seller of purple" to have consisted of a retinue of servants, is a pure assumption, unlikely in itself, unsustained by the meaning of the original word, and only increasing, instead of removing the difficulty; for if the baptism of a child, on the ground of its mother's faith, be objectionable, what shall be said of the baptism of a servant on the faith of her mistress!

The Jailer, again, believes, and straightway "he and all his" are baptized. No one is said either to have been convicted, to have enquired the way of salvation, or to have believed, but he. It is true that our English version favours the supposition that his family believed with him, but it is only through an *unauthorised transposition* of the words that it does so. The record, as the pen of inspiration left it, reads, "and he rejoiced with all his house, believing in God." If any transposition of the words were allowable, it would be the uniting of the participle to the verb, with which it agrees in gender, number, and case; the passage would then read, "believing in God, he rejoiced with all his house," both the verb and the participle being in the *singular number*. Where now is the evidence of faith on the part of the Jailer's household?

5. The practice of household baptism among *New Testament, and modern Pædo-baptist churches*, to whom it is exclusively confined in the present day, renders absolutely certain their mutual adherence to *some common principle*, that, to wit, of *infant baptism*, without which it is almost impossible that *household baptism* should occur.

As we have already seen, we never read in the New Testament of the baptism of any one in the presence of his family, without reading of the baptism of his family with him. In Baptist churches, on the contrary, the case is exactly reversed. To them, household baptism is a foreign idiom, so rarely does an instance of it occur among them. Is there no indication in this of a departure from Apostolic rule?

In Pædo-baptist churches household baptisms occur much as they did in the churches of the New Testament. The relation between parent and child is recognized and maintained, and the *new* seal of the covenant of grace applied to both of them, much as the *old* seal was applied in the family of "faithful Abraham." Now

"Look on *this* picture, then on *that*,"

and judge which of the two copies most closely the Divine original!

Our argument then—every successive step of which we think has been fairly established—may be summed up thus: Thousands of years ago the spiritual kingdom of God—*essentially one* under *both* economies, Jewish and Christian—was visibly set up on earth in the household of Abraham. By a divine law, admission to this kingdom was to be gained only through the rite of circumcision, in

the reception of which children were not only permitted, but required to be associated with their parents. In the fulness of time the King himself appears, enlarges the privileges of his subjects, and changes the rite of admission to baptism. Nothing being said that could even imply its restriction to adults, his people look for the application of the new rite *to their households*, as formerly; and agreeably to their expectation, those to whom the carrying out of the new law was entrusted—inspired Apostles—actually so administer it, *in every instance*, as far as we can judge, in which they administer it to a believing parent. An examination of several cases, incidentally recorded, leads us to the conclusion that some, at least, of these households must have contained little children, all of whom the narrative says were baptized, while it gives us no reason to suppose that any one but the head of the family believed; and hence that infant baptism must have been the practice of the Apostles.

We have by no means exhausted our subject. Indeed, from want of time, we are compelled to omit noticing much collateral evidence which would have tended greatly to strengthen our several conclusions, had we been able to introduce it. We have endeavoured, however, to present, in as concise a form as seemed consistent with perspicuity, our more prominent reasons for regarding infant baptism as a scriptural ordinance.

But we must now hastily notice several Objections commonly urged against it. We shall be told,—

1. That believers alone are to be baptized, and hence, as infants are incapable of believing, they cannot be proper subjects for baptism. But,—

(*a*) *Where* are we told that believers *alone* are to be baptized? Will our Baptist brethren be kind enough to point out the passage, or anything equivalent to it. When they do so, we will at once abandon the practice they object to.

(*b*) The objection is a *begging of the whole question*. The point at issue between us is, whether the infant children of God's people, yet *incapable of believing*, shall be baptized on the ground of *their parents' faith*, just as Abraham's children were circumcised? You will perceive that it is no reply to this question to say, No, because infant children *cannot believe*. Put into syllogism, the objection would run thus:—None are to be baptized but those who believe the Gospel: infants *cannot* believe the Gospel; therefore, infants are not to be baptized. Now if the premises were a settled point, the conclusion would be inevitable. But we demur

at once to the premises, and call on the objectors to establish them. When they *prove* that none are to be baptized but those who believe, they will have proved *everything*, and will need no more syllogisms about it. Besides,—

(*c*) The objection, if valid, imperils infant *salvation*, as well as infant *baptism*. It is certainly equally true, and far more susceptible of proof from scripture, that "None are to be *saved* but those who *believe;* shall we then follow that premise to a similar conclusion, "infants *cannot believe*, therefore infants *cannot be saved?*" Now compare the two syllogisms, and see if the conclusion in the latter be not just as much warranted by the premises, as that in the former. Clearly so; yet no one doubts the salvation of infants; and the reason of the discrepancy between the *scriptural* and the *logical* conclusion is that the premises, while correct in relation to those *capable* of believing, needs *qualifying* in relation to those *incapable* of believing—infants, for example. And this, we beg to say, is the defect in the objection with which we are dealing: it is true of *adults* that "none are to be baptized but those who believe," but we must have some proof *from Scripture* before we can admit it in relation to *infants*. If it be objected,

2. That the baptisms recorded in the New Testament were all administered upon profession of faith,—we reply, *most* of them undoubtedly were, but to say that *all* were, is to *beg the question* again; for if it can be proved that none were baptized by the Apostles except on profession of their faith, infant baptism could not have been an Apostolic practice, and the controversy is at an end. We flatter ourselves that we have shown, in the eighth and ninth sections of this lecture, some reason for believing that this was not the fact.

"Still," it may be said, "you admit that in *most* cases it involved a profession of faith." Most cheerfully. How could it be otherwise? The parents of Paul, the Eunuch, Cornelius, Lydia, the Jailer, Crispus, &c., were not *Christians:* they were either Jews or heathen, and hence the parties named had not been baptized *in infancy*. Indeed, Christianity itself must have been then a thing of the future; so that adult baptism on profession of faith would, of necessity, be its more usual character at first, just as circumcision was first administered to *adults* in Abraham's household. The Gospel was commencing its career, and as now, on its introduction into heathen lands, every convert at first is baptized upon profession of faith, so it was then; the cases are precisely analogous. The objection,

therefore, presents no difficulty whatever. Some one may ask,

3. What is *the use* of baptizing an unconscious infant?—a grave objection, truly, but one very commonly urged! To this we reply by asking two other questions;—what was the use of *circumcising* an unconscious infant? or, what is the use of baptizing an *adult?* If our friends should tell us that God enjoined the observance of these—a very satisfactory reason—we reply again, That is just our reason for the observance of infant baptism. We believe God has enjoined it upon us, and if so, it can neither be *useless* in itself, nor can it be *useless* in us to attend to it. We do not pretend that the child receives any spiritual impression from it. Itis designed to impress the *parent* rather than the child,—to teach him his *infant's* need of spiritual cleansing—a lesson which the indulgent parent needs to learn, but which *adult* baptism fails to teach.

The last objection we can stay to notice is,

4. That infant baptism upholds the grievous error of *baptismal regeneration.* Perhaps, however, our Baptist brethren will find quite as little of that heresy in Congregational churches, as among themselves. The totally undue importance which they attach to immersion, is, in our opinion, quite as likely to lead to a belief in the baptismal regeneration of *adults,* as infant baptism, to a belief in the baptismal regeneration of *infants.* We disavow the one just as emphatically as they disavow the other. But because a fraction of the Christian world, practising Pædobaptism, hold the error referred to, is it just or ingenuous to hold up an abuse of the ordinance as if it were part and parcel of the ordinance itself? As well might we charge all the errors of Smith, Campbell, and Miller, upon *immersion,* because Mormons, Campbellites, and Millerites baptize converts to their faith in that mode. Let our friends point out the evils of infant baptism, *as we administer it,* and we shall take it kindly of them.

Though not before such a diet as that at Worms, it may not be inappropriate for me to dismiss this subject in the words of the noble Luther when cited before that assembly:—"Unless I am convinced by the testimony of scripture, or by the clearest reasoning—unless I am persuaded by means of the passages I have quoted; and unless they thus render my conscience bound by the Word of God, I cannot, and I will not retract: for it is unsafe for a Christian to speak against his conscience. Here I stand: I can do no other!"

A vey brief sketch of the

HISTORICAL EVIDENCE

upon the subject of Infant Baptism must conclude this Lecture. The references to it in the writings of the earliest Fathers are not very numerous. Such as there are, however, we will endeavour briefly to present for your consideration.

1. JUSTIN MARTYR, writing A.D. 160—about sixty years after the death of the Apostle John—tells us that "many persons were then living, sixty, seventy, and eighty years of age, who were discipled to Christ *from childhood.*" The value of this passage depends upon the exact meaning of the word rendered "childhood." Robinson in his Greek Lexicon says the term is applied to "all ages, from infancy up to full grown youth;" and Liddell and Scott give quotations from Xenophon, Plato, and Æschylus, showing that it is sometimes used of infancy. If that be its meaning in this instance, (and there is no reason why it should *not,*) this reference to it is *decisive,* since some of those of whom Justin speaks must have been baptized in the days of the Apostles themselves.

The same writer also speaks of "being circumcised by baptism, with Christ's circumcision,"—an expression which clearly indicates that he regarded baptism as having taken the place of circumcision, and as being therefore applicable to infants.

2. IRENÆUS, a disciple of Polycarp the disciple of John the Apostle, writing about A.D. 180, says, "Infants, little ones, children, and youth are *regenerated* to God." Now, the term rendered "*regenerated,*" (*renascuntur,*) is very generally admitted to have been synonimous with *baptized,* among the Christian writers of that age, as they had already begun to ascribe to baptism a regenerating efficacy. Wall, Schrock, Neander, and other eminent authorities, declare that the word was constantly used in that sense. Rightly translated, therefore, Irenæus tells us that in his day—only eighty years after the death of the last Apostle—"infants, &c., were *baptized* unto God." How far is this from being *positive evidence* that infant baptism was an Apostolic practice?

3. ORIGEN, born A. D. 185, says distinctly, "According to the usage of the church, baptism is given even to *infants.*" Elsewhere, that "*infants are baptized* for the forgiveness of sins." Again, "Because by baptism native pollution is taken away, therefore *infants are baptized.*"

And once more, "For this cause it was that the church *received from the Apostles* an order to give *baptism even to infants.*" We quote this writer, of course, for his *facts*, not for his *opinions;* for, like most of his cotemporaries, he entertained very exaggerated ideas of the efficacy of the ordinance. As to *facts*, however, he is an unexceptionable witness; for besides being a very learned man, he had been an extensive traveller, having visited Cappadocia, Palestine, India, Egypt, and Greece, and must, therefore, have had access to the most reliable sources of information upon everything relating to the usages of the primitive church. Indeed, his own father, or, at any rate, his grandfather, might have conversed with men who had lived in the Apostolic age: yet such is Origen's testimony concerning infant baptism. The genuineness of these quotations is altogether above suspicion, for they are found in every manuscript copy of his works.

4. Cyprian, Bishop of the church in Carthage, was president of a Council of sixty-six bishops, convened in that city, in the year 252, to settle the question whether it was lawful to baptize a child *before it was eight days old*, which he tells us was decided affirmatively. The *divine authority* of infant baptism no one thought of questioning; the only point submitted for their decision was, *the age* at which it might be administered.

5. Augustin, who flourished about 290 years after the death of the Apostle John, assures us that infant baptism "was not instituted by any Council, but *always* has been in use." Elsewhere he speaks of "those who have been baptized when they were *infants;*" and of infant baptism as "nothing else than a thing delivered *by authority of the Apostles,*" and says that "no Christians will call infant baptism useless." Much more testimony of a similar character might be quoted from this author, but it is unnecessary. In his day the practice was undoubtedly universal.

6. Pelagius, the cotemporary and theological opponent of Augustin, and the originator of the controversy that bears his name, maintained views that would probably have led him to deny the Divine authority of infant baptism, had he been able to do so. He was charged, indeed, with doing so, but he replies indignantly, "Men *slander* me as if I denied the sacrament of *baptism to infants. I never heard of any, not even the most impious heretic, who denied baptism to infants.*"

For 700 years after this, not one solitary individual can be found who opposed it.

7. The testimony of early *monumental inscriptions* strikingly corroborates that which has already been advanced upon this subject. The following, which, along with a great number of others, may be found in Taylor's "Apostolic Baptism," are decisive:—

"Achillia, *newly baptized*,* is buried here; she died at the age of *one year and five months.*" The accompanying figure of a dove—a christian symbol of the *second century*—sufficiently marks the period to which it belongs.

"Rufillo, *Newly-baptized*, who lived *two years and forty days.* Quintillian the father places this," &c.

"To Pisentus, an innocent soul who lived *one year, eight months, and thirteen days. Newly-baptized*," &c.

"To Aristus, who lived *eight months; Newly-baptized*," &c. The date in this instance is fixed by the inscription itself—A.D. 389.

"To Leoni, *Newly-baptized*, who lived *six years, eight months, and eleven days*," &c. A.D. 348.

"Flavia Jovina, who lived *three years and thirty-two days; Newly-baptized*," &c. A.D. 367.

In other cases the term "*Faithful*"—never applied to any but the *baptized*—is used, as in the following:—

"A *Faithful*, descended from ancestors who were also faithful, here lies Zosimus; he lived *two years, one month, and twenty-five days.*" The symbols accompanying this inscription—"the anchor and the fish—mark a period of primitive and *suffering* Christianity:" that is, prior to A.D. 313 at the latest.

"Cyriacus, *a Faithful*, died aged *eight days less than three years.*"

"Eustafia, the mother, places this in commemoration of her son Polichronio, a *Faithful, who lived three years.*"

Add to the foregoing evidence

8. The fact that *not a single council*, or *sect*, or *writer* can be found during the first *ten centuries*, who disputed the Apostolic origin of infant baptism, or pronounced it an innovation. The evidence is all on one side. Gregory Nazianzen, writing about A.D. 370 urges *delay* till the child be three years of age; and Tertullian—A.D. 200—goes farther, and urges delay till *after marriage*, that all the sins of youth may be washed away by it at once. He says, "It is not rashly to be administered." "A *delay* of baptism is more profitable according to every one's condition, dis-

* Literally, "*newly planted*"—the same term employed in Rom. vi. 5, of *Baptism.*

position, or age, but especially in regard to *little ones*." But he never once calls it unscriptural or wrong. Instead, therefore, of this writer disproving the Apostolic origin of infant baptism—and he is *the only one* upon whom our Baptist brethren have to rely—he actually certifies the general prevalence of the practice within the first century after the Apostle's death!

We are aware that some eminent ecclesiastical historians have assigned it a later origin, but after all their researches they have left us totally in the dark as to *when*, *where*, or *by whom* it was introduced. Dr. Neander admits its existence in the time of Irenæus, whose master, Polycarp, was cotemporary with "the disciple that Jesus loved." Is it likely that he, who tells us that he had heard Polycarp relate "the conversations he had had with John, and others that had seen the Lord," could be ignorant of the teaching of the Apostles, in this particular, or would have practised infant baptism, had it been contrary to it? And even Irenæus—the *earliest writer* that refers to it in terms which cannot be misunderstood—speaks of it in such a manner as to indicate its general prevalence in his day. In the face of such evidence then,—not a jot of which can be disputed,—who can reasonably arrive at any other conclusion than that infant baptism is of Divine authority, and was sanctioned by Apostolic usage?

LECTURE V.

IMMERSION AS A TERM OF COMMUNION.

Acts x. 15,—"*What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common.*"

The subject of our present discourse is so intimately connected with that of baptism, that a series of lectures such as that we are now concluding would really be incomplete without some reference to it. We propose, therefore, to examine the practice of the Regular Baptists in this particular, and to inquire "by what authority" they make *immersion* indispensable to *communion* with them, and exclude members of *all other churches* from the Lord's table, while they still acknowledge many of them as Christian brethren, and treat them as such in every other respect. In doing so, we may be brought into collision with the sentiments of valued friends, connected with the denomination referred to, and possibly add to the offence we have already unintentionally given them; but conceiving their practice to be both unscriptural and injurious—and to none so much so as to those who maintain it—we have what we consider the best of all reasons for discussing it. The first point to be considered will be,—

I. The extent to which the practice of strict communion is carried.

The general principle is, to exclude *all unimmersed Christians* from participation in the communion of the body and blood of Christ; and the ground upon which it is justified that immersion was the invariable pre-requisite to admission into the New Testament churches. To this general principle we believe all Regular Baptists will subscribe. They tell us, that not having conformed to the law of Christ's house, we have *no right* to sit with them at his table. Others—many others—go farther, and would exclude their unimmersed brethren on the additional charge of wilful and obstinate disobedience to the Lord's command. They say, there is no room for honest and conscientious difference in opinion concerning the proper mode and subjects of Christian baptism; and hence, that all Pædobaptists are either culpably ignorant and prejudiced, or

else are wilfully disobedient, and, in either case, unfit for connection with the church of Christ. "You *know* better," said a Baptist friend to a member of my church, tapping him on the shoulder and nodding significantly.—"You *know* better." And that brother who "*knows* better," I have no hesitation in saying is one of the most conscientious men I ever met with. But I had nearly forgotten myself, for in deciding this question *conscience* is excluded from the witness-box altogether. Even where we are admitted to be *conscientious* in the practice of our mode of baptism, we are still denied the privilege of communion with them, on the ground previously named—our ignorance, and consequent neglect of the Divine requirement.

On these accounts Regular Baptists have separated themselves from those with whom, in every other respect, they are at agreement, in doctrine, polity, and practice; nay, more, from their own brethren of the Baptist denomination holding to free communion, whose principles they seem to regard with even more aversion than those of Pædo-baptism itself. Indeed, so great is the importance attached to this one question, that it has convulsed the Baptist body from centre to circumference, and separated chief friends, a result that by no means surprises us when we remember the tenacity with which the obnoxious principle is held. The following rules which, in substance, are rigidly enforced by strict communionists everywhere, will explain my meaning:—

1, No Regular Baptist church will allow any *unimmersed* person to sit at the Lord's table with them, whatever may be his character or standing *in any other church on earth*. "Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job," were to apply for the privilege, not having conformed to *their* mode of baptism, they would be politely requested to *withdraw!* The question is, not whether the applicant be a *Christian*, but whether he has been *immersed*. He may be fit for the kingdom of *heaven*, and for "the church of the first-born" there; but, if he has not been dipped, he is regarded as unfit for the communion of saints on *earth!* The *lowest* standing in a Regular Baptist church entitles one to communion; the *highest* standing in any other, however pure, confers no claim to it whatever. To us, at least, this seems like opening another "door into the sheep-fold," and exalting ritual observances far above christian character.

2. *No member* of any Regular Baptist church is allowed, under any circumstances, *to commune with any other church*

of Christ that does not make immersion a term of communion, under pain of discipline or excision. Such an act, unrepented of, (!) is dealt with in the same manner as drunkenness or dishonesty; it is iniquity, and the soul that commits it must be "cut off from among his people." An illustration of this rule was given me a short time ago by a Regular Baptist minister, who related it to me with a great deal of glee, as if it were above all things to be gloried in, instead of being, as I take it, the very *beau ideal* of intolerance. My informant, when a student in the Baptist College at M——, finding upon enquiry of one of the deacons of the Baptist Church in that place, that they would allow certain members of the Congregational church, who had been *immersed*, to sit at the Lord's table with them, if they desired it, replied that he did not call their's a strict Baptist church at all, and that therefore he could not, and would not commune with it. And, accordingly, never once, during all his stay among them, did he commune, either with that church or with any other; conscience forbade it!

This is not to be regarded as an extreme course, by any means, for *extremes* are obviously impossible in enforcing a rule which admits of no exceptions or modifications whatever. It is one which every strict-communionist endorses, and the only one left open to him in such circumstances; for, if his *principle* be correct, it is undoubtedly better *never* to observe the dying request of the Saviour, than to do it in the company of the *unimmersed*, or even of those who, though *immersed themselves*, cannot see it to be wrong to keep company with those who are *not* immersed! All such are "common or unclean" to him.

3. *No inter-communion* is allowed by Regular Baptist churches between open-communion, or Pædo-baptist churches and themselves, *in receiving or dismissing members by letter.* Neither confidence in the piety of the person wishing to be thus transferred, nor identity of religious belief, on all points but that of Baptism, on the part of the church to which the transference is desired, nor the absence of any church maintaining the practice of strict communion, in the place to which the person is removing,—nor all of these considerations put together,—is allowed to have any weight in such cases. The rule is inflexible. Never was Jew more careful to avoid all dealings with Samaritans, than are Regular Baptist churches to avoid all fellowship with those who are less exclusive than themselves. Witness the following fact:—A lady belonging to the Baptist church

in Brantford, applied last spring for a letter of dismission to this church, with which her husband had just connected himself on a profession of his faith. But no letter could be granted; to have done so would have been to acknowledge the Congregational church as a scripturally organized church of Christ—a thing not to be tolerated for a moment!

Take another case, for the truth of which I can vouch:—An old lady, well-nigh eighty years of age, belonging to a Congregational church in Canada, became through infirmity unable to attend the church with which she was connected, or even to enjoy its monthly communion, as she was living a number of miles away from the place in which it assembled. Feeling naturally desirous of something more than a nominal connection with the people of God, and not knowing the straitness of the gate into the Regular Baptist Church, she sought the privilege of occasional communion with it, by letter from her own church. Was it permitted? No, no! She must be *immersed*—aged and infirm as she was—she must be immersed before she could sit down at *their* table! Staggered at the reply, and not knowing what to do, she asked her minister's advice as to whether she should submit to what she regarded as a "commandment of men," or give up her cherished desire of communion with God's people. Her minister, as I think, very unwisely, advised her to submit to it, and accordingly she was immersed—a trophy of strict Baptist principles.

4. Regular Baptists virtually *deny the right of any ministers but their own, either to receive, or to dispense the Lord's supper*. Their Pædo-baptist brethren are sometimes invited to preach for them, just as a matter of convenience, or as any well-qualified though unordained brother would be, under similar circumstances. They are often invited, moreover, to take part in their tea-meetings and anniversaries, and the like, and on such occasions all is courteous enough. But supposing it to be communion Sabbath, and the pastor absent from home,—the Pædo-baptist brother is in the pulpit, and directly before him the communion table is spread with the emblems of the Lord's body and blood,—will he be invited to *preside* at the supper? Or even to *partake* of it? No; the church will either omit the observance of it altogether, or the deacon will dispense it; and the brother to whom they have just listened with pleasure and profit, as he has been discoursing upon topics suitable to so solemn and delightful an occasion, if he should take his seat among them, will be told, (in the gentlest manner

possible, it may be, but how can it be *gentle* in any case?) that he can have no part nor lot with them in *that* matter!

Do you say this is an uncommon occurrence? It may be so, but if it be, it is only because good care is taken, on *both* sides, not to be placed in so unpleasant a position. I can furnish two instances of this, however, which I know to have occurred, in both of which the parties thus excluded were Congregational ministers with whom I am intimately acquainted. In one case, the brother who preached, never dreaming that he had been preaching to a close-communion church, left the pulpit, and took a seat in one of the pews, thinking only of the feast of love he was about to enjoy; when lo! the deacon comes to him with the intimation that as their's was a strict Baptist church, they did not expect him to *commune* with them. And so, putting on his hat, he withdrew, with no very pleasant reflections, though perhaps quite as pleasant as the reflections of those whom he left behind him.

In the other case, the pastor of a Baptist church being suddenly taken ill on the morning of the communion Sabbath, sent for a Congregational brother, who had no pastoral charge at the time, to supply his place. On ascending the pulpit he observed that the communion table was spread in preparation for the Supper, but *between* the preacher and the table stood *the open baptistery*, looking, as he thought at the time, very much as if *symbolical* of the path he must tread before he could sit down at it—viz., *through the water!* It was accidental, and the deacons apologized for it by telling him that the water, which was intended to be used in the evening, had been a little *overheated*, and had been left uncovered to cool. His exclusion from the supper afterwards, however, was *not* accidental, but the enforcement of a principle, whether a good or a vicious one we shall see presently.

I can only add upon this point the remark of Rowland Hill, so characteristic of that good and original old man, when excluded from the table of a strict Baptist church under similar circumstances,—"I beg your table's pardon; I thought it was *the Lord's* table." Rowland Hill had caught the idea of the ordinance exactly. It *is* the *Lord's* table, and not *our's* or *their's*—where all are brethren, and all are to be received whom the Lord has received, and where nothing is to be regarded as "common or unclean" that "God has cleansed."

But if the whole truth must be told, our strict brethren go farther still, for

5. Regular Baptists *deny the validity of immersion* even, when *administered by a Pædo-baptist.* In other words, they do not acknowledge an *unimmersed* minister competent to baptize in any mode. Such a position is equivalent, in our judgment, to *unfrocking* nine-tenths of all the evangelical ministers of the Gospel in the present day, and establishing an Apostolical succession, equal in its pretensions to that of the Church of Rome. The administration of the two Christian ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper is usually regarded as the peculiar prerogative of the minister of the Gospel. Deny him that, and you deny his ministerial standing altogether. Yet this is precisely the ground which Regular Baptists churches take in relation to every *unimmersed* preacher of the Gospel; they deny him the right to perform either of the acts which belong, *par excellence*, to the office he professes to fill.

But lest I should be thought to bear false witness against my brethren in this matter, I must adduce the proof of what I have said of them. During the progress of the revival last spring, several persons, Baptists in sentiment, but preferring connection with this church, applied to me to know if I would immerse them. I replied immediately that I could not, but that I would make arrangements with some less scrupulous Pædo-baptist brother to come and do it. This was agreed to, and I obtained at once a promise from a neighbouring minister to come and immerse them. The want of a baptistery was the next difficulty, and as everybody does not like open-air baptism, it was likely to prove serious. At this juncture, however, I heard of an informal offer of the use of the one in the Baptist church for the occasion, *provided that the administrator had been himself immersed!* Truly "that was the unkindest cut of all." We might have been thankful for the offer had there been no such *proviso* about it, but such a condition as that, implying that none are competent to administer baptism but Baptists, is one which a Pædo-baptist church would not be very likely to accept if they had any respect for their principles, or their minister.

But now, mark you what this involves. If all *my* baptisms, even should I perform them by immersion, are invalid, because I have not been immersed; then, of course, no baptisms can be valid but those which have been performed by immersed ministers. Let me, then, interrogate some Baptist brother as to the validity of *his* baptisms: how many generations do you think we could go back before we should find a defect in the succession? Mr. D. was

immersed by Mr. C.,—Mr. C. by Mr. B.,—Mr. B. by Mr. A., and so forth. But supposing that the person who immersed Mr. A. had never been immersed himself, then, according to strict Baptist rule, not only are all Mr. A.'s baptisms invalid, but all those of B., C. and D. likewise. *One defective link* in the chain, no matter how remote, imperils every secceding link down to the end of time. The assumption is therefore subversive of itself, and is, to say the least, rather delicate ground for Baptists to take, even for the validity of *their own* baptisms. To us it is the quintessence of the principle which runs through the claim to Apostolic succession. The Romanist, and the High Churchman say, "your ministers are not ordained, because their heads never felt the pressure of episcopal hands—the hands of those who alone are authorised to ordain:" the Baptist says, "your baptisms are not valid, because neither you, nor the persons who ordained you, were ever immersed by those who alone are authorised to do so, or to perform any other ministerial act."

The question naturally arises in this connection, upon what does the validity of a baptism depend? If an immersion by a *godly* minister, who has *not* been immersed himself, be *invalid*, would an immersion by an *ungodly* minister, who *has* been immersed, be *valid?* Shall the act of a *bad* man be valid and acceptable to God, *because he has been immersed*, and the like act of a *good* man be null and void, and an abomination, because he has *not* been immersed? Our Baptist brethren—if we understand them correctly—say emphatically, yes?—and my proof of it is, that while the validity of the baptisms of some who have turned out to be ungodly men among them, has never been doubted, the validity of an immersion by a godly Pædo-baptist is distinctly denied. Is there nothing anomalous here?

But, enough upon this point. I intend no offence by it; I have desired only to show to what an absurdity such an assumption would lead. I am satisfied that very few, if any, of those who are chargeable with it, really lay claim to all that it clearly involves. If any among them do assert such a claim, the only conviction it can carry with it is, that "even now are there many anti-christs." We will no more recognize *the* Church in the Baptist communion alone, than in the Papal.

The practice, then, we are opposing, utterly annihilates all intercourse between churches of the same faith and order,—prohibits, under pain of discipline, any fellowship between acknowledged members of the same family of God,

in that which constitutes one of their special privileges,—denies the validity of all ministerial acts but those performed by a Baptist—virtually unchurches all other communions of Christians—and all this on the pure assumption that the sorely-debated mode of baptism by immersion is the *only* scriptural mode.

We come now to investigate,

II. The argument for strict-communion. Our Baptist brethren would not, of course, take a stand so likely to be misunderstood, and to give offence, as that to which we have referred, did they not possess what *they* consider scriptural warrant for it. Mark you, we prefer no charge of schism against them; for, while they separate from us, and exclude us from their fellowship, we believe them to act conscientiously, and often at a considerable sacrifice of personal feeling, in so doing. In *spirit*, many of them are *open*-communionists, but from what we cannot help thinking a sad misapprehension of duty, they erect a new "middle wall of partition," between themselves and all others, quite as high as that formerly existing between the Jew and the Gentile, which Christ broke down to make all his people "one." They are just as clear and decided *whom* to eat with, as Peter was *what* to eat; any one *unimmersed* being, in their view, undoubtedly "*unclean.*"

The process by which they arrive at this conclusion may be thus stated:—Baptism, which can be performed by immersion only, was made by the inspired Apostles, a uniform and indispensable pre-requisite to church fellowship; and hence to receive the unbaptized to communion, would be an alteration of the basis upon which the Christian church has been organised. Or, put into strictly logical form, it would read thus;—The New Testament requires us to exclude all unbaptized persons from the Lord's table; Pædo-baptists are unbaptized; therefore the New Testament requires us to exclude them from the Lord's table. The *conclusion* is legitimate enough, supposing the *premises* to be correct, but to both the latter we demur as *assumed*, and not established, and shall now proceed to assign our reasons for doing so.

1. The first point assumed is, that the New Testament requires us *to exclude all unbaptized persons* from the Lord's table. We ask, *where* does it require us to do so? *Where?* We might, were we disposed to "strive for masteries," rather than for truth, adopt our Baptist brethren's own principle, and demand of them *explicit command* to exclude the unbaptized, just as they demand of us explicit com-

mand to baptize infants. The retort would be perfectly fair, for the cases are exactly analogous. But we will be satisfied with a reasonable amount of evidence that in thus excluding them, they are fulfilling the Lord's will, in whatever manner he may have chosen to reveal it. Can our strict brethren, then, produce any example or precedent from the New Testament, in support of their practice? Any instance of some gifted minister, "whose praise was in all the churches," edifying the brethren by his *preaching*, and then being requested to withdraw from the *communion* which followed it? Or even of some humble Christian being similarly dealt with for the same reason? Not one! nor anything like it! nor any occurrence from which they might *infer*, even, that such a course *would* have been pursued had such a case arisen!

Upon what then does the argument for strict-communion rest? The reply is, the great commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved, &c." Mark xvi. 15, 16. The Apostles acted, we are told, in accordance with these instructions, in planting the early churches, uniformly making baptism a pre-requisite of Christian fellowship. Now, we not only admit this, but strenuously contend that they did so. We hold, as firmly as any one, to the perpetual obligation of baptism, as the initiatory right of the Christian church, and have never known of an instance in which any one was admitted to communion in a Pædo-baptist church without having received it, either in infancy or adult age. The statement made in the reply to my first Lecture, that a lady, now connected with this church, had been a member of the Wesleyan Methodist church for a number of years *without having been baptized*, was not correct, and a charge of that nature against our brethren of that denomination we feel it to be simply justice to deny. The lady referred to *never was a member* of that or any other church, until received into our communion by baptism. We repeat, therefore, that we know of no body of Protestants, but Quakers, that does not make it a rule to receive only baptized persons into fellowship.

But does it follow that because such is the *rule*, there can be no *exception* to it? In the days of the Apostles there could have been no such dispute as now exists, in relation to the mode and subjects of baptism. Acting under divine direction the brethren were all of one mind, and hence any resistance to the inspired rule would have proved a total unfitness for Christian fellowship, in the party offering it.

No wonder if one so disobedient and contentious had been rejected, as manifesting the very opposite of the spirit expected in a renewed man. But would such a case have been at all analogous to that of Pædo-baptists in the present day, even if they *are* unbaptized? Do our Baptist brethren themselves think our refusal to be immersed, evidence that we are not the subjects of divine grace? If they do, why invite us to preach for them, and otherwise coöperate with them in various Christian efforts? If they do not, why deal with us as the Apostles dealt with the blaspheming "Hymeneus and Alexander," utterly devoid of saving grace? To us, then, the mere absence of any case in the records of the New Testament churches, in which any one unbaptized gained admission to the fellowship of the saints, appears far too narrow a basis upon which to erect so grave a principle as that we are discussing; and this will become still more manifest by attention to the following considerations:—

(*a*) The New Testament affords indubitable evidence that *the only condition of membership* in the primitive churches, was the possession of *Christian character*. While none were received who did not confess Christ, none were rejected who did confess him. Here, again, our Baptist brethren and we are agreed. Both contend, that the churches, acting under the direction of the Apostles, required evidence of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and of the renewal of the heart by the Holy Spirit, before they admitted any one to their communion; and both contend, further, that the practice of the primitive churches, in this particular, is binding on us in the present day. The great question for every soul is, "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" What question is there that can rival it in importance? Put it side by side with any other, and see how every other is eclipsed by it! Place yourselves in imagination upon your dying bed, and while some one offers to baptize you, let the Saviour stand beside you with the offer of salvation, and to which would you attend? Oh how your anxious eye would turn to Him who loved you, and gave Himself for you! Baptism! what is that to faith? Truly, but as the small dust of the balance in the sight of God. Not that we would for a moment underrate its value, for everything is of importance that God enjoins. But yet, comparing the two, which, think you, was likely to be made the term of admission? I appeal to the judgments, and Christian feelings of God's people present, for an answer.

The writings of the New Testament generally, bear me out in this position. Among those who have "put on Christ,"—*i. e.*, dedicated themselves to him—the Apostle says, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all *one in Christ Jesus.*" Gal. iii. 28. Again he says, "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but *faith which worketh by love.*" Gal. v. 6. Again, "Ye have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him; where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but *Christ is all and in all.*" Col. iii. 10, 11. And once more, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but *a new creature;* and as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God." Gal. vi. 14–16.

Furthermore, the parties to whom the Apostolic Epistles were written, were addressed as believers,—saints,—holy and beloved,—their *renewed nature*, and not their *baptism*, being recognized as their chief distinction. They are commanded to receive one another in the faith, and not to doubtful disputation, the grand motive presented being that God had received them. Their essential unity is spoken of as consisting in their having been all baptized, not in one *mode*, as our Baptist brethren seem to understand it, but "*by one Spirit*, into one body,"—the body of Christ. 1 Cor. xii. 13. Indeed, we hardly know where to begin or where to end in adducing quotations in support of this point. There can be nothing more clear, one would think, than that evidence of faith in Christ was made by the Apostles *the sole condition* of church membership; baptism is never once hinted at in such a connection. And that, we maintain, should be the only term of communion among christians now. What should any church want more? Who shall call them unclean whom "God hath cleansed?"

(*b*) The Lord's Supper was instituted, and observed, *before* the institution of Christian Baptism; hence those who first partook of it, must have done so *unbaptized.*

When, let me ask, did Christian baptism originate? Clearly not until *after* the death of Christ, while the Supper was instituted *before* it. Our close-communion brethren themselves tacitly admit this, in laying the

foundation of their argument in the great commission al ready referred to, that not having been given till forty days after the resurrection.

The simplest way of settling this point is by enquiring when *Christianity* originated, for *Christian baptism* before the establishment of the *Christian religion*, is hardly less than absurd. It certainly originated neither with the birth of Christ, nor with the ministry of Christ, for during his whole life-time he carefully observed the feasts of the Jews, and the requirements of the Mosaic law. It must, therefore, have originated with *the death of Christ*, the great Sacrifice for sin, when the veil of the temple was rent in twain, emblematic of the opening of the "new and living way." All, we believe, are agreed that that moment closed the Old Testament dispensation, and began that of the New. No baptism, therefore, could be *Christian* baptism before that period. Neither that administered by John the Baptist, nor even that administered by the disciples of Christ, under His inspection, can have been so regarded, from the circumstance named; for to say nothing of several important points of difference between these baptisms and those subsequently recorded, the *re-baptism* of some of John's disciples, mentioned in Acts xix. 1–7, sets the matter at rest. The fact, moreover, that Peter, when preaching to the thousands present at Pentecost, many of whom must have been among the multitudes baptized by John three or four years before, recognized no distinction among them on that account, but commanded them to "repent and be baptized, *every one* of them, in the name of the Lord Jesus," places the point beyond dispute. How could John have administered *Christian* baptism, when he distinctly tells us (John i. 33) that he did not know Jesus to be the Christ until he saw the Spirit descending upon Him at the moment of His baptism?

Nothing, then, can be clearer than that the Lord himself, the Master of the feast, administered its sacred emblems with his own hands to unbaptized disciples.

(*c*) Not only had the Apostles never received Christian baptism when the Lord's supper was first instituted, but there is no evidence of their *ever* having received it. When, or by whom, were they baptized? The only act recorded at all resembling baptism, is the washing of their feet just before the institution of the Supper. If that be accepted as baptism, it certainly was not performed by immersion, for our Lord says, "He that is washed, needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit." But if

that be *not* acknowledged, as we know it is not, where else do we read of their baptism? Now if immersion was intended to be a term of communion in the Christian church, is it at all likely that so singular and important an omission should have occurred, either as to the fact, or as to the record of it? Our strict brethren may be very much shocked at it, but we avow it as our deliberate opinion that the Apostles never received any other baptism than that of the "cloven tongues, like as of fire"—an opinion by no means peculiar to ourselves.

Should any object, that as none were ever permitted to partake of the Passover without having first been *circumcised*, no one has any right to sit at the Lord's table without having first been *baptized*, we beg them to beware how they institute such a comparison, lest by admitting the existence of the analogy, they should concede a point we endeavoured to establish in our last Lecture—that baptism has taken the place of circumcision; in which case it would be difficult for them to maintain their ground against Infant baptism. But supposing them thus to jeopardize their argument against Infant baptism, for the sake of an argument in favour of close-communion, what force is there in it? "Circumcision is *expressly stated* as a necessary condition of admission to the Passover; *a similar statement respecting baptism* will decide the controversy. The neglect of circumcision, which could proceed from nothing but presumptuous impiety, incurred the sentence of excision—'that soul shall be cut off from his people.'"* Hence the cases are totally dissimilar, there being neither the express condition that baptism shall in every instance precede admission to the Supper, nor the manifest impiety on the part of the unbaptized, that formed the ground of excision in the case of the uncircumcised.

We have thus, we think, fairly overthrown the first of the propositions upon which the argument for close-communion is based, viz., that the New Testament requires us to exclude all unbaptized persons from the Lord's table, by showing that evidence of faith in Christ, and not baptism, was the only term of communion among primitive Christians; that the Supper having been instituted before Christian baptism, those to whom it was first administered must have received it, being yet unbaptized; and that, so far is baptism from being indispensable to communion, there is no evidence of the Apostles themselves ever having been baptized at all.

---

* Hall, on Terms of Communion.

The overthrow of *one* of their premises invalidates the conclusion at which the advocates of strict communion have arrived; but we will now look at the other and see if it be any more tenable than its fellow. It is affirmed,

2. That Pædo-baptists—or more strictly speaking, those who have not been immersed—are unbaptized.

This proposition assumes, of course, that we have not the shadow of a reason for believing that baptism is properly administered by affusion or sprinkling, totally ignoring the fact that *nine-tenths* of the Christian world, and an equal proportion of the *learned* among them, have deliberately reached that conclusion. The assertion lying at the very foundation of this premise, that *baptizo* always signifies to dip, we have already shown to be totally incapable of proof. It may serve an end to assign to it now a *literal* meaning, and now a *figurative*, just as it may suit the purpose of the party translating it; but the end is surely victory, and not truth, that is sought by such means. To dash past every crooked sentence that will not be squared and straightened by Baptist rule and compass, as *figurative*, may be very skilful in argument, but is much less valiant for truth. The wetting of Nebuchadnezzar with the dews of heaven—the drenching of a man with wine—and the pouring down of the influences of the Spirit, were not *figurative* but *literal* baptisms. Until our Baptist brethren can prove that in none of these instances did anything actually *descend*, they fail to prove them *figurative*. To take such liberties with language would utterly destroy its meaning. Let a Unitarian read the first verse of St. John's Gospel with such an example before him, and what will he make of it? "In the *beginning*," that is, at a *very remote* period, the time of the creation of Adam, or earlier—"was the Word," a *figurative* expression for God's attribute of wisdom—"and the Word was *God*," that is, either the divine attribute spoken of, or *a god*, an inferior deity, a creature of exalted rank. This is precisely the manner in which Unitarians do treat that passage and a thousand others. This one they interpret *literally*, and that one *figuratively*, just because it suits their purpose to do so. We are sorry to see our Baptist brethren copying so unsafe an example.

To us it appears not a little like presumption in our opponents, with such a weight of opinion and evidence against their theory, to take to themselves the exclusive title of Baptists, and tell all the rest of the world that they are unbaptized, because they are unimmersed. Who are to settle the point—the *one*-tenth, or the *nine*-tenths? If Baptists refuse to

bow to the opinion of the *majority*, we certainly have much more reason to demur to that of *a small minority*, especially when their theory is encompassed by so many difficulties that to us, at least, appear insurmountable. We can assure our friends that they will have to compassionate the case of their unimmersed brethren for some time longer yet, unless they can do more to convince them than evade the *literal* meaning of hard sentences, and quote the admissions of Pædo-baptist authors, who conscientiously continued, nevertheless, the practice of infant baptism and affusion. Strange that their admissions, so eagerly caught at, had so little weight with themselves!

But why, if immersion alone was to be recognized as baptism, was not the matter placed forever beyond dispute by the use of a word to which "all the lexicographers and commentators" could have assigned but one meaning? There *is* conscientious difference of opinion about *baptizo*, the sad consequence of which is, if Baptists are right, that nine-tenths of the Protestant world are unbaptized, and multitudes of real Christians are excluded from the only Scriptural communion. About *Buthizo, Duno, Dupto, Kataduno, Pontizo*, and some other Greek verbs, there could have been no dispute. Each of these expresses, unquestionably, a *total submersion*, in every instance; and we cannot doubt but some such word would have been employed to designate the act of Christian baptism, had it been intended to confine it to that one mode only.

No such objection lies against the practice of sprinkling or affusion, since we do not regard it as necessary in order to the validity of a baptism that it be administered in either of these modes; but for the success of immersion, the choice of such a word was essential.

The argument against our mode of baptism fails, therefore, in two important particulars—the absence alike of any statement in the New Testament that would clearly invalidate it; and of any evidence that the word by which the ordinance is designated of necessity expresses the act of immersion. Hence our Baptist brethren fail to substantiate their *second* proposition, that Pædo-baptists are unbaptized; and, in our judgment, the whole argument for close-communion falls to the ground. But we must briefly notice,

III. The objections to which the practice of strict-communion is liable. We regard it,

1. As a direct violation of the law of Christ concerning our treatment of those who conscientiously differ from us

on the non-essentials of the Gospel. By non-essentials we mean, of course, those doctrines or practices, the reception or rejection of which does not affect our salvation, of which baptism is acknowledged to be one. Concerning these points differences of opinion have existed in almost every age of the church, not excepting the Apostolic; as for instance in relation to the observance of circumcision, the keeping of certain days, the eating of herbs, and of meats offered to idols, and afterwards sold in the markets by the priests of the idol temples, &c. Foreseeing these differences, the Lord, rather than lay down specific rules for every conceivable case, has seen fit to provide us with one general principle to regulate our intercourse with brethren who differ from us. It may be found in several of the Epistles, but it is stated most fully in Rom., 14th chapter; 15th chapter, 1–7 vs.; and 1 Cor., 8th chapter. We commend the whole of these passages to your prayerful attention; the following verses, however, will be found especially in point:—"Him that is weak (*i. e., doubtful* as to any minor point of doctrine) in the faith *receive ye*, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth: *for God hath received him.* Who art thou that *judgest another man's servant?* to his own master he standeth or falleth; yea, he shall be holden up; for God is able to make him to stand. One man esteemeth one day above another; another man esteemeth every day alike. *Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.* Rom. xiv. 1–5.

Close-communion, with such plain intimations of Christ's will, standing on the pages of the New Testament, is to us nothing less than an unaccountable anomaly.

It is no reply to these quotations to tell us that *baptism* is not mentioned among the things which were to be made matters of forbearance, and that the neglect of baptism is a much more serious affair, than the eating of meat that had been offered to an idol; for according to the testimony of our opponents themselves, baptism is nothing more than a non-essential, and *all* such points are plainly comprehended by the principle laid down. Besides, how have our brethren been led to the conclusion that baptism is of such superior importance? Do they not *think* so, just because they have long been accustomed to making it a term of communion? *We* presume to think otherwise, and for this reason: the eating of meats that had been offered in sacri-

fice to idols was looked upon by some as an impious participation in heathen idolatry, and is our sin in the neglect of immersion equal in enormity to *that?* "*Sitting at meat in the idol's temple,*" (1 Cor. viii. 10) actually *imperilled the souls* of some for whom Christ died, but does our *refusal to be immersed* endanger any soul? We leave you to judge, therefore, whether baptism is a matter of such vastly superior importance as not to come within the range of the principle referred to.

But now, mark the reason *why* they were commanded to receive one another as brethren, notwithstanding these diversities of opinion upon minor points. "Let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth, *for God hath received him,*" v. 3. The argument is clear: no matter how much a brother may differ from you in such matters, if *God* has received him; or, in other words, if there be evidence that he is a Christian, *you* must receive him, "What *God* hath cleansed that call not *thou* common."

The question then, resolves itself into this form, *has God received* that weak and erring Pædo-baptist brother that wishes to sit down at that close-communion table? If there be evidence that *He* has received him, the command of the Apostle, nay of the Church's Head, is "receive ye him; judge him not, to his own master he standeth or falleth; yea, he shall be holden up, for God is able to make him to stand." He that is an heir of glory, may surely be a partaker with us in the means of grace. Andrew Fuller, though a strict-communionist in practice, says he never had ventured to oppose open-communion when placed upon *that ground.*

Nor is it any reply to what has been advanced upon this subject, to tell us that we will not receive any one to the Lord's table unbaptized, and that the only difference between Baptists and Pædo-baptists on this question is as to what constitutes baptism; for while that is the *rule,* and a very just one, we can easily conceive of exceptions to it. For example, Quakers,—among whom there are many of the excellent of the earth,—deny the perpetuity of the obligation of Baptism, and the Lord's supper; but were one of the members of that Society, giving evidence of piety, to come to me as an applicant for fellowship, *without baptism,* could I refuse him? I *dare not,* with such a law of Christ before me. I should probably endeavour to convince him of his error, but even were I to fail, I should still feel bound to receive him. We admit that his *conscientiousness* alone would not be sufficient reason for entertaining his applica-

tion, but if our Baptist brethren cannot discern any difference between the conscience of such a man as Saul the persecutor, who "verily thought that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth," and the conscience of an humble believer, we can. The argument therefore,—*ad hominem*, as was supposed,—that Baptists are really no closer in their terms of communion than Congregationalists, utterly fails. Under certain circumstances we would receive a conscientious christian to the Lord's table, *unbaptized*; and we should be rejoiced to see our brethren do the same, and thus substantiate their assertion, that they are as open as we are.

2. We regard the practice of strict communion as having a tendency to alienate the affections of the people of God from each other. How *can* we feel as cordial with our Baptist brethren as we otherwise should do, while they continue to exclude us from participation with them in that observance in which above all others the unity of God's people is symbolized? "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body, for we are all partakers of one bread." 1 Cor. 10, 16, 17. What does their fellowship amount to if this is withheld? My brother will speak brotherly words to me *out of doors*, but if I should sit down with him *at the family meal*, he would rise, and utterly refuse to eat, *unless I am excluded*. Entire cordiality under these circumstances is next to impossible, especially since we regard such a course as totally at variance with the spirit of the Gospel. Jesus prayed that all his people might be one, that the world might believe that God had sent him, but the practice alluded to appears, to us at least, to have quite an opposite tendency.

The influence exerted by it on the members of the Baptist body themselves is anything but salutary. Others, besides the present speaker, can see some of its sad results in the *general exclusiveness* of those who adhere to it, and the excessive *touchiness* they betray whenever any one presumes to differ from them in opinion. But as I do not wish to increase the offence I have given by my plainness of speech, I forbear to say more on this point. We object to the practice,

3. As tending to sow discord among brethren. It has done so among Baptists themselves. Open-communionists, though quite as strenuous as their stricter brethren

in their opposition to any other baptism than immersion on profession of faith, are ostracised and disowned by Regular Baptists, for believing, as we do, that Christian character, and not baptism, should be made the only term of communion. It is true that they are only a small minority on this continent, but we are gratified to learn that in England the two bodies are much more nearly equal in number, and that far less prominence is given to the whole subject of baptism there, than is common in this country. A lady of my acquaintance, who regularly attended a Baptist chapel in England for six years, does not remember having once heard the subject presented, during the whole of that time, except in a few brief remarks preparatory to administering the ordinance. I may state also, that while on a visit to that country, five years ago, I had the privilege on one occasion, of communing with the Baptist church under the care of the Hon. and Rev. B. W. Noel who is an open-communionist. John Bunyan, and Robert Hall,—two of the most celebrated names that have ever been connected with the Baptist body,—were both of them of the same school. And it is an interesting fact, that Bunyan's church, in the town of Bedford, still flourishes, with a membership of between three and four hundred persons. A recent visitor reports that baptism is performed by immersion, or sprinkling, as the candidate may desire, and that those who wish it can have their children baptized.

It is clearly not necessary, therefore, that one should be an advocate for strict-communion because he is a Baptist, since the most determined opponents of the practice are found among Baptists themselves.

LECTURE VI.

REVIEW OF REV. T. L DAVIDSON.*

According to announcement I purpose now to review a few of the more prominent points in the Lectures which have been delivered in the Baptist Chapel in reply to my own. The remarks I have to offer will necessarily be of an exceedingly desultory character, since the points requiring notice cover the entire ground which has been gone over; and therefore, to maintain anything like connection will be altogether out of my power. All that can be done will be rapidly to glance at them in the order in which they were discussed, and dismiss them. Some few statements have already been replied to in the previous lectures, when they have fallen into my path; for I beg to say instead of their having been prepared for months before-hand, as my reviewer has twice stated, they have been written from week to week, just as his own have been. The review of my

I. Lecture, was chiefly occupied in a stout denial of the several "railing accusations," as the Lecturer was pleased to term them, which I had brought against the denomination to which he belongs, his texts or mottoes. Acts xxviii. 22: 1 Peter iii. 9; iv. 14–16,—being chosen to fix upon the present speaker the odium of employing language in relation to *them*, which Michael the arch-angel would not use "when contending with the *devil*."—which was one of his illustrations. (Jude, ver. 9.) I could not help thinking that some of his texts were singularly inappropriate; for whether

* The foregoing Lectures, which were delivered on Monday evenings, were reviewed by Mr. D. on successive Friday evenings. The writer, however, anxious to avoid anything like *debate*, refrained, as much as possible, from any allusion to his reviewer during the delivery of his own course, but thought it needful to reply to him in an additional Lecture. When first requested to publish, he had thought of incorporating his reply with the previous Lectures; but as the committee to whom their publication was entrusted, expressed a wish that they should appear substantially in the form in which they were delivered, he has waived his own judgment in the matter.

my lecture was of the stamp alluded to, or not, I certainly did not reproach my Baptist brethren "for the name of Christ," but for things which I thought dishonoured that name. My first remark was, that they attach undue importance to the whole question of Baptism. I did *not* charge them with making immersion a saving ordinance; on the contrary, I distinctly disavowed such an opinion. What I *did* say was that expressions are often used, and means employed to induce young christians, and even others, to be immersed, which are calculated to produce such an impression on the popular mind; but was that reproaching them *for the name of Christ?*

My second was, that they often employ mere assertion instead of argument, and charge their Pædo-baptist brethren with ignorance, prejudice, and a want of conscientiousness when they presume to differ from them;—was that "persecuting them for *righteousness sake?*"

My third remark regarded their disposition to ridicule our mode of administering the ordinance of baptism; and if I did indulge in what might be thought a similar disposition, on one occasion, it was only to show them that immersion was quite as open to ridicule, as "baby-baptism." And now that they know how it *feels*, to have their own conscientious convictions trifled with, I hope they will henceforth be more careful of any conscientious convictions their neighbours may entertain upon the subject, and not trifle with theirs.

My last remark was, that great injury is often done to the cause of truth, in the discussion of this subject, by raising false issues—obtaining a show of victory, by demonstrating some point which no one ever thinks of disputing, while the question itself is totally lost sight of. Was *that* reproaching them "for the name of Christ?"

Whatever my sin has been, therefore, it certainly has not *that* complexion; nor do I think I have been guilty of railing at all. In what does railing consist? Did Paul rail on Peter when he "withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed?" Or did he not rather exhibit a commendable example of brotherly faithfulness and regard? Now while I lay no claim to the high and noble feeling evinced on that occasion, I *can* say that I referred to these things because I thought our Baptist brethren were to be blamed for them. I needed not to be reminded of the Judgment seat, or of my accountability to God for my course. I was aware of that, and acted in view of it all. Nothing would have induced me to say what I did, but a

deep sense of the evils I endeavoured to point out. If my spirit was unkind or uncharitable I was not conscious of it, and if my statements were incorrect I am certainly innocent of wilfully bearing "false witness against my neighbour." Does my Reviewer seriously mean to tell us that my charges were groundless?—that Baptists never ridicule the conscientious convictions of their Pædo-baptist brethren?—that our arguments are always dealt with fairly? I appeal to the christian public all over the Province for an answer. But if the charges be well-founded, where is the railing?

I am aware that my statements were *denied* by wholesale; to have *disproved* them would have been much better, though far more difficult; but if correct, to have *confessed* and bewailed the fact, would have been best of all. I may be permitted to hope, however that the things referred to will be forsaken, even though unconfessed.

Two other points only, in this lecture, require any attention.

Whether the tradition that Paul was *tricubitarus*, or only three cubits—about four feet six inches—in height, was mentioned in jest, as I think it must have been, or in earnest, it was certainly no reply to the remark which it was intended to meet—that Baptists attach much more importance to mere baptism than Paul did. If in jest, it was trifling with a serious subject: if in earnest, it has suggested an additional reason for regarding immersion as impracticable in some circumstances.

In reply to the statement that baptism received altogether too great prominence among the themes of the Baptist Pulpit, we were told that during the last ten months only five sermons had been preached,—*only five*—in the Baptist chapel, in defence of immersion, while *ten* sermons had been preached by Pædo-baptist ministers in defence of their own views, during the same period of time. Now there are six Protestant Pædo-baptist churches in the town, so that had each of their ministers preached on the subject as frequently as their Baptist brother, the number would have been *thirty*, instead of *ten*. But besides this, the numbers given, even supposing them to be correct for the period referred to, do not by any means exhibit the *usual* state of the case on either side. They bear no proportion whatever to the fact in the long run. The reason why so many discourses have been recently preached on the subject by Pædo-baptist ministers is to be sought in the exuberant zeal of our Baptist brethren themselves, and the nothing

less than outrageous things they have lately said about other bodies and their views. On the other hand, in consequence of my request that all controversy should be avoided during the progress of the revival, no sermons at all were preached on the subject in the Baptist chapel, during several months of the time; who knows how many would have been preached had I not requested silence? The comparison therefore, should have been made to cover a period of several years, and then a very different result would have been obtained.

The commencement of the

II. Lecture, in review of mine, was largely occupied with a laboured attempt to overthrow my argument for baptism by affusion, derived from the mode of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, exception being taken to it for two reasons particularly.

First, I was charged with *assuming* that the *pouring out* of the Spirit, and the *baptism* of the Spirit were different phrases for the same thing, and was asked for proof. I plead guilty, for indeed I had not supposed proof of a point so clearly established could be needed; but since it is called for, you will find it in Acts xi. 15, 16. "And as I began to speak," says Peter, "the Holy Ghost *fell on them* as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." The descent of the fiery emblem of the Spirit's influence, elsewhere spoken of as "poured out" upon the disciples, reminded the Apostle of the promise of the Saviour, and was regarded by him as the fulfilment of it. If that be not the obvious meaning of the passage, surely language cannot be depended upon. But if *baptizo* be applied to the pouring out of the Spirit, or his influence, why may it not to the pouring out of water?

My reviewer next directed his heaviest artillery against the supposition that the baptism of fire, promised Matt. iii. 11, was fulfilled by the descent of "cloven tongues, like as of fire," which sat upon each of the disciples at Pentecost. He might have spared his strength, however, for much more serious work, for while I did, and still do think that to be the most natural interpretation of the promise of any that I have met with, my argument does not depend for a moment upon the correctness of that view. Whatever may have been the nature of the baptism—whether of the Spirit, of his influences, or of fire—it was performed by *affusion;*

that was the ground upon which my argument was based, and that ground, as it seems to me, remains unshaken. The room was not first filled with the influence, as a baptistery is filled with water for an immersion, as we were told; nor were the disciples *dipped into* the influence. They were all in the room *when it descended*, and it *fell upon* them —circumstances, to neither of which is there any parallel in immersion. If, therefore, our Baptist brethren would copy this mode, they must put their candidates *into an empty baptistery*, and then *pour water upon them* in any quantity they deem sufficient. No ingenuity can ever make anything else of it.

My remarks concerning the new version of the Bible were next assailed, an attempt being made to show that the American Bible Union is not in any sense a Baptist organization. We are aware that it is often spoken of as unsectarian by those who support it, but it is not a little singular that they fail to so large an extent to induce the world to believe them. The fact that one of the translators is a Congregational minister by no means proves it to be so. Had that gentleman been chosen by the Congregational body, as their *representative* at the board of revision, it would have been proof that they countenanced the movement; but he was not. He was selected by the executive committee; is paid by them for his services; and is, perhaps, set to work upon some portion of the inspired Volume, in the translation of which his Pædo-baptist sentiments can scarcely leak out; so that all his appointment can prove is, the fact that they stood in need of a Congregational translator! Several facts, however, will set before you my grounds for believing the Society to be chiefly, if not solely, a Baptist organization.

1. Every member of the executive board is connected with some one or other of the denominations practising immersion.

2. The translation of two-thirds of the Bible is committed into the hands of one man, and he a Baptist.

3. The disputed word *baptizo* is, in the new version, in every instance rendered *immerse*. And,

4. The Society derives its support almost exclusively from Baptist churches. Its agents look first to them in all cases, and although here and there one is found to discountenance the movement, the majority of them espouse it.

Any of you who may wish to see these statements substantiated, will find them given in the *New York Observer*, of July 17, and August 14, 1856.

The *fact* therefore remains, that our Baptist brethren are specially anxious to secure the completion of this new version; the *explanation* of it I leave to yourselves.

I was next represented to have quoted Mal. iii. 2, 3,—"he is like a refiner's fire," &c.,—and several other passages, as referring to baptism, which, I need not say, was not the case. They were adduced simply to show that as fire is a purifying element, as well as water, the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and the baptism of fire, were expressive, not of *purification*, and of *judgment*, respectively, but of *the same truth;* and hence, that both clauses of the promise were fulfilled in the descent of the divinely-chosen emblem. How any other construction could have been put upon my language, I am at a loss to understand. Either my reviewer, or his staff of reporters, must have been very dull of hearing at the time.

The only other point in this lecture that I have time to notice is the adroit manner in which my remarks upon Rom vi. 4, were avoided. It will be remembered that I went somewhat at length into the discussion of its meaning, and that, for a number of reasons which I need not reïterate, I did not regard it as containing any allusion whatever to the mode of baptism. Such is still my conviction.

Now, I had a right to expect that in a review of my lectures, some notice would have been taken of my objections to the Baptist view of this passage, especially as my remarks upon it occupied one-third of my lecture. But a shorter, and much more convenient method of disposing of them was adopted. Half-a-dozen Pædo-baptist commentators are named, who *think there may be* some allusion to immersion in the figure. Wonderful! What authorities Barnes and Doddridge become when they suit my Reviewer's purpose. On Romans vi. 4, Barnes is almost an infallible, but on the meaning of *baptizo* in Matt. iii. 11, or 1 Cor. x. 2, he has lost his inspiration, and falls again to the level of ordinary, erring, Pædo-baptist mortals!

Now it may look like a death-blow to my explanation of the passage to announce that six Pædo-baptist commentators have taken a different view of it, and ask whether the opinion of the Congregational minister of Brantford, or that of the aforesaid six be the more reliable? But is that *argument*, or *evasion?* My Reviewer did not tell his audience how many Pædo-baptist commentators might be named who think the passage *does not* contain any allusion to immersion, or that several of those named, even, speak of it as only *probable*. Barnes, for instance, upon whose opinion

so much stress was laid, says the existence of such an allusion "cannot indeed be *proved*, so as to be liable to no objection." Were I disposed to retaliate, therefore, I might ask whether the opinion of the Baptist minister of Brantford, or that of *a host* of Pædo-baptist commentators, be the more reliable?

The truth is, this constant parading of strange and unpronouncable names by the advocates of immersion—Criptolius and Olearius, Guerike and Bretschneider, Rheinwald and Koppe, Schleiermacher and Hagenbach, Stourdza and Scholz, Hahn and Kaiser, &c.,*—ill accords with their oft-repeated assertion that they make their appeal to the Bible alone, eschewing the traditions of the elders, and calling no man master. Would that it were so! One might then hope for argument, instead of a continual re-hash of musty quotations, *usque ad nauseam*, on the subject.

I claim, therefore, in the absence of any other reply, that my argument in relation to Rom. vi. 4, remains unanswered.

In the review of my

III. Lecture, there were several palpable misrepresentations of my meaning. After a vain attempt to explain away Dr. Carson's admission that he stood alone, or nearly so, in assigning only one meaning to *baptizo;* and an amusing allusion to my temerity in "gouging out a dead lion's eye, and playing with his paw," my Reviewer represented me as having assigned *forty-two* meanings to the word in question, which I need not say was incorrect. I did not presume to offer any opinion of my own upon it at all, but simply adverted to the fact that the ablest Greek Lexicographers had given it from five to eight meanings, and that one author had shown it to have been rendered into English by no less than forty-two different words, of which I mentioned twenty. These words do not necessarily represent so many different significations, since many of them are nearly synonimous; as for instance, to *overwhelm, overflow, rush upon*, all of which express substantially *the same mode* of baptism. As well, therefore, might we argue that Baptists admit it to have *five* different significations, because they affirm that it means to *immerse, dip, plunge, submerge* and *drown*, although we know them to insist upon its having but *one*.

But now, mark the use to which my Reviewer put his

* "Baptist sentiments confirmed by the testimony of the most learned Pædo-baptists." Rev. R. A. Fyfe, Toronto.

mistake. Selecting some of the most unusual of the terms by which *baptizo* has been rendered, he proceeded to apply them to a number of passages in the New Testament in which the word occurs, as follows—the audience being meanwhile convulsed with laughter at the *joke*—"Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, *daubing* them in the name of the Father," &c.; "John did *soak* in the wilderness, and preach the *soaking* of repentance," &c.; "Ye shall be *painted* with the Holy Ghost, and with fire;" "I *smeared* the household of Stephanas; besides, I know not whether I *oiled* any other," &c., &c. I grieve to have to repeat the profanity. It may, however, have been regarded by some of his audience as a fair reply to my application of *dip* to some other passages of the New Testament, on the Monday evening previous. If it was, a very few words will suffice to point out the difference in the two cases. Dr. Carson says that the *only* meaning of *baptizo* is, to *dip*. Very well; if it be, it was certainly fair to render it, in any instance of its occurrence in the New Testament, by that word. That was all I did. But have I ever said that *daub*, or *smear*, or *soak*, is the *only* meaning of *baptizo*, or that it ever possesses either of these significations in the New Testament? Had I said so, the reply we are considering would have been logical enough, though even then, sadly deficient in the respect that is due to the Word of God. But was it fair, because the word in question has been translated by over forty different English terms—a fact my reviewer did not pretend to dispute—to select just such of them as he chose, and apply them to just such passages as he chose? Surely not, and a moment's reflection upon it must convince him that it was both illogical and irreverent to do so.

My quotations in illustration of the meaning of *baptizo* and *bapto* were next despatched in a very summary manner, the lecturer reserving to himself apparently the right of deciding that this one was *literal*, and that one *figurative*, just as he saw proper; but as most of the objections usually urged against them were anticipated, and met at the time they were adduced, I need say but little more concerning them. You are all of you quite as capable of deciding whether the expressions they contain are literal or figurative, as either my reviewer or myself, and to your judgment, therefore, I commend them. The baptism—ritual purification—of tables or couches, spoken of in Mark vii. 4, was boldly claimed to have been performed by a total immersion, notwithstanding their cumbrous form and size, and the frequency with which they were liable to defilement.

An attempt was next made to subvert my argument from the meaning of the verb *amad*—always used in the Syriac version of the New Testament to express the sense of *baptizo*—by the statement that Buxtorf, in his Syriac Lexicon, assigns to that verb no such signification as the one I said originally belonged to it—to *stand*. Now the truth is, the word in question was not originally a Syriac, but a Hebrew word, with the sole signification that I claimed for it, as a reference to any Hebrew Lexicon will show. Yet the Syriac translators of the New Testament passed by several words already belonging to the language, having the undoubted meaning to *immerse*, or *dip*, and adopted in preference this Hebrew term, with the equally undoubted meaning to *stand*, to express the act of Christian baptism! A strange selection, indeed, if the act was originally performed by immersion only!

That this word did not wholly lose its primary meaning on its adoption into the Syriac language, is evident from the fact that one of its derivatives—*amuda*—is twice used in the New Testament, (Gal. ii. 9; Rev. x. 1,) as the exact equivalent of the Hebrew *ammudim*, *pillars*, the inherent idea being that of *standing*.

All this is perfectly consistent with the fact that Buxtorf renders the word to *baptize*, *wash*, &c. That unquestionably became its meaning after its adoption by early Christian writers; but my argument is founded upon its *original* signification; and I ask again, why, if baptism was then performed by immersion only, was it designated by a word of a totally opposite meaning?

The argument from the meaning of *deipnon*,—the word employed to designate the Lord's Supper,—was similarly evaded. I claimed that as *deipnon* properly signifies a full meal, and yet is applied by the inspired writers to eating a morsel of bread, and drinking a sip of wine, *baptizo*, even could it be shown to mean nothing less than immersion in the Classics, might, in like manner, have a narrower signification when applied by the same writers to the associated ordinance of baptism. The reply to this was, that *deipnon* is found but once in the New Testament, and then not in the *command* to observe the Supper. I cannot say whether my Reviewer meant that the word occurred in only one instance in the New Testament, or whether it is employed only once to designate the ordinance of the Lord's supper. If the former, he was incorrect, for a reference to Bagster's Greek Concordance will show that it occurs sixteen times in the New Testament; if the latter, the objec-

tion is utterly valueless, for *one* such application of it by an inspired Apostle, whether in the form of simple allusion to the ordinance, or in that of a command to observe it, establishes its use in that sense as well as *a hundred* could do. It were a strange principle of interpretation truly, to deny the authority of every statement in the word of God, however plainly made, that stands *alone!* Is there not, therefore, just as much reason to think eating a full meal at the Lord's table essential to a true participation in the ordinance of the Supper, as there is to regard immersion essential to a true baptism?

But, we are told, the Greek Church immerses, and ought not Greeks to know the meaning of *baptizo*—a Greek verb? Let us see:—the Greek Church is the apostate rival of Rome, deplorably ignorant and corrupt, and in some respects worse than the Papal church itself. It is the established church of Russia, with large numbers of adherents in the Turkish Empire. Then we are to go to ignorant Russians and Turks for the meaning of *baptizo,* or the proper mode of baptism! Upon what other point in Christian doctrine or practice, let me ask, would our Baptist brethren be willing to make such an appeal? Is there one? No, not one; not even upon the kindred question of infant baptism, for the Greek church, admirable authority as it is with them upon the *mode* of baptism, immerses *infants!* Upon *that* point, in common with all others except that of the mode of baptism, they would regard it as having so utterly forsaken "the foundation of the apostles and prophets" as to be totally unworthy of credence or respect.

The objection assumes, however, that the adherents of the Greek church speak the Greek language, than which nothing can be a greater mistake. To the immense majority of them that language would be as foreign as it is to us. And even were the modern Greek their vernacular, they would still be a very incompetent authority upon the question before us; for the modern Greek is as different from the ancient as Italian is from Latin. As well, therefore, might we enquire of Italians the meaning of some passage in Cicero or Sallust, because their forefathers, two thousand years ago, spoke Latin, as appeal to the Greek church to tell us the meaning of *baptizo!*

My remarks upon the baptisms of Cornelius and the Jailor were dwelt upon very briefly, and met, or rather *evaded* by the usual conjectures; but the examination of such conjectures would be a task as endless, as it would be fruitless, and I shall therefore pass them by as unworthy of any notice further than they have already received.

Next come a shower of objections to my argument from the number of John's baptisms, several of which I must refer to. The first related to my statistics. And certainly if I have displayed a fondness for "arithmetical hypothetical calculations," in the course of this discussion, my Reviewer has had quite a *horror* of them. He evidently is quite averse to *figures*, and would rather have his audience satisfied with general statements, than descend to particulars, which are often an *experimentum crucis* to the finest theory. But truth demands attention to figures, and we will therefore look at them again.

Proof was wanted that "Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan," contained a population of three millions of souls. Now, I had given as my *data* for this estimate two historical facts—first, that three millions of persons, most of whom must have been males, over twelve years of age, were present at the Passover in Jerusalem, thirty-five years after the period referred to; and, secondly, that eleven hundred thousands of Jews perished at the taking of that city, after all the Christians had fled from it, forewarned by the prophecy of Christ. Was it, then, an over estimate to set the entire population down at three millions?

Great pains were then taken to show that *all* the inhabitants of this region were not baptized,—a point that was established most convincingly, though, as it seemed to me, quite needlessly, since I had myself conceded it, and based the "arithmetical hypothetical calculation" that followed it, upon *one-sixth* of the estimated population.

The next objection related to the *time* which I supposed to have been occupied in baptizing this immense multitude. John might have spent *six years*, we were told, instead of *six months*, in immersing them; aye, and even then he would have had a hard task, for the difficulty only assumes a new aspect. But I have already anticipated and answered the objection, and shall therefore dismiss it without further remark.

The conjecture that John might have been assisted by his disciples in baptizing the people, and that the seventy disciples of Christ might, in like manner, have assisted the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, needs no reply. The narrative gives us no hint of the kind, and I have, therefore, much more reason to think that they did not, than my Reviewer has to think they did. Besides, if the seventy disciples assisted the Apostles, there are seventy more *baptisteries* to account for, which I am satisfied it must have been impossible to find.

Where, then, is the unreasonableness of my calculation, or of the conclusion I drew from it? *The largest number my Reviewer ever heard of* as having been immersed in one day, by one individual, was *one hundred and fourteen;* while, if my estimate at all approximates to the truth, John must have had to immerse *between two and three thousand* daily, for six months in succession, and without any sabbath rest! To reduce my estimate to *one half*, or even *one fourth* of what it was, would hardly perceptibly lessen the difficulty; for the immersion of *seven hundred* persons a day, by one administrator, would be as utterly impossible, as the immersion of several thousands. The Baptist hypothesis, therefore, so far at least as John's baptisms are concerned, may fairly be regarded as incapable of support.

The only other point I can stay to notice in this lecture is the grave objection that was raised to my view of the reason that led John to locate himself at Ænon,—the abundance of water which the place afforded for the animals which the people must have brought with them. Where, it was asked, do we read of horses or asses? Truly, the narrative says nothing about them, does it? The *silence*, which was thought to offer no difficulty whatever in relation to baptisteries, and assistant administrators, is now made an insuperable objection. But admitting that we do *not* read of camels or asses, (of *horses* I said nothing,) what then? How else could the people travel? Certainly not by any of our modern conveyances—railway, or steamer, or stage. Unless, therefore, they came on foot—which in the case of women and children is hardly credible, as many of them must have come from considerable distances,—they must have travelled on camels or asses, my Reviewer to the contrary notwithstanding. The

IV. Lecture was a review, nearly two hours in length, of my lecture on infant baptism, the first point of attack being the argument from the Abrahamic covenant, to which a number of objections were urged. These I shall endeavour to deal with, not by quoting great authorities, as mine have been dealt with, but by looking at them *seriatim*, and ascertaining their value. Most of them, indeed, have already been anticipated, but the reproduction of them by my Reviewer happily affords me the opportunity of establishing some points connected with the controversy, more fully than I was able to do in my former lecture. It was objected,

1. That we cannot infer the practice of infant *baptism* from that of infant *circumcision*, since the latter was ex-

pressly commanded, while the former is not. But if, as I have endeavoured to show, the covenant with Abraham still exists with his spiritual seed—a point which no attempt was made to disprove, however strenuously it was denied—with the simple change of the seal from circumcision to baptism, where is the need of express command to *include* infants? They were already included, and we do not *exclude* them from participation in the blessings of the covenant with the new seal, because Christ does not; "of such is the kingdom of heaven." When our Baptist brethren shall produce some such instructions to the Apostles as these, "take heed that your Jewish notions do not lead you to *baptize infants*, just as you have hitherto been accustomed to *circumcise* them, for *adults alone* are to have the new seal applied to them;" or when they present us with anything from which we may fairly infer that to have been the divine intention, we will abandon our practice of infant baptism. It was objected,

2. That circumcision was not administered to infants on the ground of their parent's faith, but because God commanded it.

But why did God command it? Why were Ishmael and Isaac singled out as the first recipients of this distinction? What other intelligible reason can be given for it than this —they were *children of Abraham?* And why was the covenant established with Abraham, but because of his *faith?* Hence after all they were circumcised on the ground of their parent's faith. The objection is a mere quibble in order to escape an unpleasant conclusion.

3. My Reviewer next denied that baptism has taken the place of circumcision. We were first told that I had made no attempt to prove that it had, though it was admitted afterwards that I had quoted Col. ii. 11, 12, in support of the point. It was urged, however, in reply, that "the circumcision of Christ" was not *baptism*, but *the renewal of the heart;* and that it was this inward renewal that was henceforth to take the place of the external rite. Are we then to understand that regeneration is *the exclusive characteristic of the Christian dispensation*, just as circumcision was of the *Jewish?* If inward renewal be the circumcision of the New Testament economy, and its peculiar glory, *taking the place* of that enjoined upon Abraham, it must follow that Abraham, and the ancient worthies of the Jewish Church, were strangers to an experience which we cannot but regard as essential to salvation. But if, on the other hand, "the circumcision of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the

letter," (Rom. ii. 29), was already known under the Old Testament, how can it be said, in any sense, to have *taken the place* of the external rite under the New?

The passage in question seems intended by the Apostle to meet the Jewish objection, that circumcision had no place in the Christian system. Now, it would be no reply to the objection to say, that we have a spiritual circumcision in its stead, for the objector might quote the Apostle's own language, in another Epistle, in proof that the *spiritual* circumcision was already enjoyed by the Jew. It was the discontinuance of the *external initiatory rite* of the Jewish religion that was complained of—a complaint fairly met if we understand "the circumcision of Christ" to mean Christian baptism, the external initiatory rite of the Christian religion; but met by no other interpretation of the Apostle's language.

Add to this the fact of the exact correspondence in the meaning and objects of the two rites, enlarged upon in my former lecture, and you have an amount of evidence in support of the position that baptism has taken the place of circumcision, that, in my judgment, amounts almost to demonstration. This is the view that some of the earliest Christian writers took of the subject. Justin Martyr, writing only about forty years after the death of the last Apostle, says distinctly, "we are circumcised *by baptism* with Christ's circumcision;" and again, speaking of spiritual circumcision, he says "we have received it *by baptism*." St. Basil and Chrysostom use singular language, but as they flourished a century or two later, I will not quote them.

4. The fourth objection urged was, that baptizing infants on the faith of their parents, is religion by proxy. But in what respect does the parent become the *proxy* of the child, in dedicating it to God in baptism? Does he profess to believe *in the stead* of his child? Or to confess sin for it? Does he repent for it? Or renounce the world for it? No, nothing of the kind; and surely there cannot be much religion where repentance and faith are absent. What then does the parent do? Simply this—he professes his solemn conviction that the little child, around which all his parental affections are entwined, has an evil nature, and must be renewed by the Holy Spirit; that God, who has promised to be a God to his seed, as well as to himself, will, if he prayerfully and believingly lays hold of His covenant, renew the heart of his child: and to that covenant therefore, he solemnly attaches his seal in having it applied

to his child. Is this religion by proxy? Would it not rather be the life of the church were there more of this earnest solicitude?

The mock-sympathy therefore that was expressed for the condition of unbaptized children, under the injustice we were supposed to do them by withholding the rite from them, without any fault on their part, was quite uncalled for. If "the blessing of Abraham" is to "come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ," *i. e. through faith* in Him, how can the mere application of the seal of the covenant procure it for the children of one who *does not believe* in Christ? Or how can the unbelieving parent covenant with God for his child, before he has embraced the covenant for himself?

Had sympathy been expressed at the thought of so many being unblessed with Christian parentage, it would have been much more in place; but I am not surprised at nothing been said on that point, since my Reviewer avowed it as his opinion that God regards the offspring of Christian parents precisely as He does the children of the ungodly. A dark and dreary doctrine that! Is there nothing said in Scripture about being "beloved *for the fathers' sakes?*" However some may despise it, and others deprive themselves of its blessings by their unbelief, this is God's covenant with those who love Him, "My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of *thy seed*, nor out of the mouth of *thy seed's seed*, from henceforth and forever." It was objected,

5. That the Lord's Supper should be administered to infants if we baptize them. The reply to this is very simple. Permit me to ask whether our *Baptist* brethren think it proper to admit infants to the Lord's table? Of course not. Then, do *Pædo-baptists* think it proper to do so? No. Then we may at once dismiss that part of the objection, since both parties are agreed, however they may differ about infant *baptism*, that infant *communion* would be *wrong*.

But the inference drawn from this is, that infant *baptism* must be wrong also, though in what way the inference is drawn would be difficult to say. The exercise of faith in the atoning sacrifice of Christ—an act which adults alone are capable of performing—is regarded by both Baptists and ourselves as requisite to *communion* in His body and blood: when our brethren succeed in showing that the same act is the invariable pre-requisite of *baptism*, they will have settled the controversy between us, for, of course, infants

are incapable of believing. But that they cannot do, both the household baptisms of the New Testament, and the household circumcisions of the Old, being opposed to their construction of the commission upon which they found their practice. The infant of eight days was surely as incapable of apprehending the meaning of the one, as our's are of apprehending the meaning of the other. If, therefore, there be any such absurdity as is sometimes supposed, in administering the initiatory rite of the Christian church to unconscious infants, there must have been at least equal absurdity in administering the more painful initiatory rite of the Jewish church, to infants of a still more tender age.

Moreover, the circumcised infant was as incapable, physically and morally, of partaking of the Passover, as the baptized infant is of participating in the Supper. The Jew became "a son of the *covenant*" at eight days of age, but he did not become "a son of the *commandment*"—*i.e.* one under obligation to attend the feasts of the Jews—until twelve years of age, the age at which Jesus first attended them along with his parents. The objection fails then, in every point, and we shall therefore dismiss it for the next, which is,

6. That if baptism has come in the place of circumcision, we ought to baptize our servants, and ought not to baptize females.

This objection can have no weight, unless it be shown that servants and females stand in exactly the same position now as formerly. Now, without conceding one *iota* to the slaveholders of the South, it is evident that Abraham *owned* servants,—some who were "born in his house, or bought with his money." He therefore exercised authority and control over them which no one among us possesses over a domestic. *His* servants were a part of his house, and were doubtless in the habit of regarding him much as they would a parent; *our's* are not under our control in matters of religion at all.

Then as to the second point of objection, it is well known that the position of the female under the Christian economy, is widely different from what it was under the Jewish. The male was formerly considered above the female. The women worshipped by themselves as inferiors, and do so still in Jewish synagagues. The husband was the lord of the house, and hence, the submission of the male, the *superior*, to the rite of circumcision, involved the submission of the female, the *inferior*, to the terms of the covenant, without such a rite. There was no occasion for the application of the seal to females under the law, but there *is*

occasion for it under the Gospel; for, alluding to this very change in their social condition, Paul says that in Christ Jesus "there is neither bond nor free, neither male nor female," Gal. iii. 28. Accordingly, the Apostle baptized "both men and women," so that not a shadow of doubt is left upon the subject, and therefore not a particle of force in the objection.

7. It was urged, that we require Baptists to prove a *negative*, (which is unfair), when we ask them for evidence that baptism is *not* to be administered to infants.

This would be true had there been *no previous mention* of any arrangement such as that which is involved in infant baptism, or no intimation that such arrangement was intended as "an *everlasting covenant*" with believers and their offspring. But such an arrangement *did* exist under both the Patriarchal and Jewish economies, exhibiting internal evidence of perpetuity, and hence our Baptist brethren should be prepared with proof of its divine abrogation, or of such change in its reqirements as would justify their exclusion of children from participation in its blessings and seal. This we demand of them; fidelity to truth compels us to do so. They *assert* that the Abrahamic covenant has passed away; we simply ask them to *prove* their own assertion, and this is asking proof, not of a *negative*, but of an *affirmative* proposition.

Neither do we call on them to prove a *negative* when we ask for evidence that there were no children in either of the households whose baptisms are recorded in the New Testament; they set themselves the task of doing so. Had *oikos*—the word translated *household*—generally signified a household *without children*, it might have been regarded as factious to make such a demand; but meaning, as it does almost invariably, *a family* consisting of *parents and children*, it ought to be so understood, unless our Baptist brethren can show cause why it should not, in these particular instances; and that they cannot do. We are contented to take the word in its usual acceptation, and think they should be also. But not liking the conclusion to which that points, they set themselves to prove a negative,—viz., that the word is *not* employed in its usual signification, in the instances referred to—and then throw the blame upon us!

8. The eighth and last objection urged against infant baptism was, to my mind, the most astounding of all, and was to this effect,—That the absence of any thing in the New Testament expressly prohibiting or condemning infant

baptism, could not be taken as in any wise affording a warrant for the practice of it, since the New Testament *does not condemn* many of the worst errors of Popery—the baptism of bells, the worship of the Virgin Mary, auricular confession, the sacrifice of the mass, &c., &c!

Truly, thought I, our Roman Catholic friends will "thank thee for that word!" My Reviewer will surely have to renounce this ground, if ever he should attempt to convince any one of the errors of the Papal Church. If the New Testament does not condemn the things specified, on what ground do we condemn those who practice them? Is the Bible no longer "the religion of Protestants?"

If my Reviewer meant, however, that these things are not forbidden *by name*, he should have said so, and then he might have greatly extended his list by adding to it baptisteries, and apparatus for heating the water, mackintosh dresses, baptizing habits with leaden sinks, immersions in mid-winter, &c., and the argument in relation to one, is just as valid as it is in relation to the other. These are all of them inventions of a later age.

It will be remembered, however, that I have never conceded that the New Testament is silent upon the subject of infant baptism, for I do not think it is. The frequent incidental mention of household baptism is, in my judgment, conclusive that children hold substantially the same relationship to the church under the Christian dispensation that did under the Jewish; and that conclusion has with me all the force of a positive injunction to baptize them.

The following are some specimens of the singular style of *argument* with which this lecture abounded, which I cluster together for the sake of brevity:—"Give us positive precept for, or example of, infant baptism in the New Testament."—"If the Abrahamic covenant still exists, let them use the knife, and circumcise."—"The Lord's supper is not said to have come in place of the Passover."—"The Apostles never baptized any, save on profession of their faith."—"We do not see how Pædo-baptists can avoid the doctrine of baptismal regeneration."—"We demand *proof* that there were any children in these households."—"Whenever Mr. W—— refers to the Greek he blunders."—"He must prove that Lydia was a married woman; that she had children; that they were at home, &c."—"We deny *in toto*," &c., &c.

The only reply I feel called upon to make to such statements as these, is to remind you of the remarks I offered in my first lecture, on the employment of assertion, instead

of argument; as well as of some others in my fourth, on the kind of evidence our opponents are at liberty to claim from us. Questions of the grave importance of those which are involved in this discussion, are not to be settled by such a mode of dealing with them. If our case be so desperate that we have not a shadow of authority for our practice of infant baptism, my Reviewer's case must be so clear that it would be the simplest thing in the world to prove it. Why then resort to assertion, when argument would be so much more satisfactory? Why present us with such conclusions, and leave us to grope our way in the dark, through the logical processes by which they have been arrived at?

One remark, however, claims some attention; not because it is any more convincing than the rest, but because it may mislead some of my less intelligent hearers. I am asked for proof that Lydia was *married*, &c. But why select *Lydia* particularly? Why not ask it in relation to Cornelius, or the Jailor, or Narcissus, or Crispus, or Stephanas? Who knows whether *any of them* were married? True, we read of their *households*, but we never read of their *wives*. But neither of these suits my Reviewer's purpose so well, so nothing is said about any one but Lydia.

Now there is precisely the same evidence that Lydia was married, and had children, that there is in relation to any of the rest; or, indeed, in relation to any one else, whose house is mentioned in Scripture, but whose husband or wife is not. She had a *family*,—the obvious meaning of *oikos*,—or they had not; and she had a *house* to which she could invite the Apostles, or they had not. The same terms are employed in relation to all of them. And surely, when any one has informed us of his family, and his dwelling, we do not need to enquire of him whether he has ever been *married!*

Besides, apart from the signification of *oikos*, I had already shown that three out of four households, if not even five out of six, contain young children; and hence that the probability,—and that is all there can be on either side,—is altogether in favour of the view we take of the narrative.

The attempt made to show that the family of the Jailor must have consisted of adults alone, because the Apostles "*spake the word* of the Lord, to all that were in his house," struck me as exceedingly lame; for on the same principle, the solemn prophetic warnings of Ezekiel, or Jeremiah, to "the whole house—*oikos*—of Israel," equally disprove the

existence of any young children among all that nation! How could the infant Jew "hear the word of the Lord," any more than the infant of the Jailor?

The reply to my remark that we nowhere read in the New Testament of the baptism of a child of Christian parents, on his making a profession of faith, was an entire evasion. Not being able to produce such a case in the New Testament, my Reviewer sallied forth in search of one in Ecclesiastical History; and by the time he had reached the *fourth or fifth century*, he found several such instances,—that of Ambrose, and others. But the fact that no such case is recorded for three centuries after Christ, is itself strong presumptive evidence that the primitive churches practised infant baptism.

My ignorance, or something worse, of Baptist missions was next commented on, for having said that household baptism is a thing next to unknown among the churches of that denomination. We were assured that household baptism is a very common occurrence among them; that two cases of it had occurred in Brantford during the past year; and that it was particularly common among the Karens, though why among the *Karens* particularly, we were not informed.

But let me define a household baptism, and we will see if it be common among them. In the several instances of its occurrence, recorded in the New Testament, *every member of the family*, so far as we have any means of knowing, was baptized, and *all on the same occasion*. Nothing, therefore, can properly be called a *household baptism*, but the baptism of *a whole household simultaneously*. So it is administered by Pædo-baptists, and so we believe it to have been administered by the Apostles. Now apply this test to the cases spoken of by my Reviewer, and see how they will bear it. One of those said to have occurred in Brantford, during the past year, I *know* will not suffer investigation; *all* the family were not baptized. Of the other case I know nothing whatever, but from the unfair manner in which that already referred to has been used, one cannot help entertaining strong suspicions in relation to it also.

The occurrence of fifty cases among the Karens is certainly remarkable, especially when we consider that if they are at all in point, none of these families could have contained children so young as to be incapable of believing: and that in each separate instance, *all* the adults must have believed, professed their faith, and been baptized simultaneously! A circumstance of such rare occur-

rence everywhere else, can be accounted for among the Karens, only by supposing the existence of some mental or moral idiosyncrasy among them.

The assumption that "the brethren" whom Paul and Silas are said to have "seen, and comforted," before departing from Philippi, were the members of *Lydia's household*, we are not at all disposed to admit. We have just been challenged for proof that Lydia was married; now, however, my Reviewer conceives of her either as the mother of a large family of adult believers, or, as some wealthy lady, with a retinue of servants, numerous enough to constitute a church among themselves! But a very slight examination of the narrative will be sufficient to convince any one that it is quite as likely there were "brethren" *out of* her household, as that there were brethren *within* it, especially as she alone is said to have "attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul." The Apostles had spent "many days" in Philippi, (v. 18,) and although no conversions are recorded but those of the two whose households were baptized, it is surely unwarrantable to conclude from hence that there were no others. Knowing therefore, of the imprisonment, and probably also of the release of the Apostles, and of their intended departure from the city, these Philippian brethren would repair to the house in which they had lodged, to take their leave of them. We are not told, indeed, that the interview took place in the house of Lydia at all. The Apostles may have "seen the brethren" in their own homes, though whatever the way in which they met them, our conclusion must be the same. To speak of Lydia's family as "the brethren," instead of using the term *oikos*, employed in the account of their baptism, is surely an indefiniteness of which the inspired narrator is seldom guilty.

A few brief observations on the review of the historical evidence which I presented on the subject of infant baptism, must conclude my remarks on this lecture.

My quotation from Justin Martyr, who says that "many persons were then living, (A. D. 160,) sixty, seventy, and eighty years of age, who were discipled (baptized,) to Christ *in childhood*," (*ek paidōn*,) was rejected as too indefinite to merit attention. The words in question are, nevertheless, quite as capable of bearing the meaning I have given them, as that given them by my Reviewer.

Exception was taken to my next, from Irenæus—"infants, little ones, children, youth &c., are *regenerated*, (*renascuntur*) to God,"—in two ways;—first, that it was not

baptism but regeneration that is intended by the word employed; and secondly, that the passage was an interpolation, by some scholiast, or transcriber of the writings of Irenæus.

Now if the passage has no reference to baptism, and is utterly valueless to us, it was surely superfluous to attempt to prove that it was an interpolation; or rather, not to *prove* it, for that was not attempted, but to make us believe it.

And as to the meaning of the word *renascuntur*, Dr. Neander says, "now in the mind of Irenæus, regeneration and baptism are intimately connected, and it is difficult to conceive how the term, 'being born again,' can be employed with respect to this age, to denote anything else but baptism.* Dr. Wall, author of the "History of Infant Baptism,' takes the same view of it, and so do other writers of equal eminence. The passage should be translated therefore, "infants, little ones &c., *are baptized* unto God." This language is used, you will observe, only eighty years after the death of the last Apostle.

The quotations from Origen, born A.D. 185, were admitted to be authentic, but the Christianity of the age in which he lived was regarded by my Reviewer as so corrupt, that it was not surprising that infant baptism should have been practiced in *his* day. Baptists have always admitted, we were told, that infant baptism existed in the days of Origen. But that is only a part of what these quotations prove. Origen, a very learned man, and a most extensive traveller, not only asserts its existence *in his day*, but distinctly assures us, "that the Church received an order *from the Apostles*, to give baptism even to infants." It were strange indeed, if the practice had originated, and all trace of the date and manner of its origin had been lost, within a single century after the close of the Apostolic age!

My Reviewer then concluded with the following statements, so strangely self-contradictory, that we wonder how he could have permitted himself to make them.

We were told,

1. That there is no evidence of the existence of infant baptism during the first and second centuries, *i. e.*, previous to A. D. 200. Yet he had just told us that Baptists had always admitted its existence in the days of Origen, born A. D. 185!

---

* Neander's Church History, Vol. I. page 431, Bohn's Edition.

2. That there is no mention of infant baptism before the date of the Council of Carthage, (A.D. 252.) Yet Tertullian was quoted as opposing the practice, and he died A.D. 220!

3. That infant baptism took its rise in the dark regions of North Africa, at the end of the third, or the beginning of the fourth century,—say A.D. 280—320. Now as this is the first time that I remember to have heard a Baptist brother attempt the solution of this (to them) exceedingly difficult problem, I may be permitted a single remark or two upon it.

In the first place, I should have liked some *proof* of the correctness of this assertion, if it is to be had, and not the mere *ipse dixit*, however positive, of anybody upon the point.

Secondly. The regions of North Africa, my Reviewer should have known, were not as *dark* at that time as they are now. On the contrary, there was no country, probably, in the world, in which the Gospel had been more generally received. Alexandria was called the cradle of Christian philosophers, from the number of eminent men it had produced; and Carthage was almost equally celebrated; and both of these were in North Africa. Nine hundred bishops,—the name given originally to *all* Christian pastors,—are mentioned by one writer, as having occupied a comparatively small part of it. And

Thirdly. The assertion that infant baptism arose in the end of the third, or the beginning of the fourth century, so conflicts with the two previously made, that even if we knew not how to answer it, it would destroy our confidence in all of them. All that is necessary is to put them side by side, and they subvert each other. Infant baptism took its rise in North Africa, A.D. 280–320: yet the Council of Carthage, A.D. 252, decided unanimously that it was not necessary to delay baptism till the child was eight days old; Tertullian opposed the practice A.D. 190–220; and it is admitted to have existed even in the days of Origen, born A.D. 185! I leave my Reviewer to reconcile his own statements. Truly, "the legs of the lame are not equal."

A very few remarks on the

V. Lecture, in review of mine on Immersion as a Term of Communion, must conclude the present discussion.

The extent to which I had shown the practice of strict communion to be carried, was not only admitted but justified, the defence set up being that the principle upon

which it is founded—viz., the precedence of Baptism in point of time, to the Lord's Supper,—is acknowledged to be scriptural, and acted upon as such by Pædo-baptists themselves. It was urged that we differ from each other, not upon the terms of communion, but upon the mode of baptism, and that if there be any *closeness* in their practice at all, it must originate in their views of the latter, rather than of the former.

The reply would have been specious enough, had it not already been fully anticipated and answered, by showing, first, that there is no ground for regarding immersion alone as baptism; and, secondly, that the New Testament does not, either positively or by implication, make it essential to communion, even if there were.

A feeble attempt, indeed, was made to overthrow my position, that Christian baptism having been instituted after the ordinance of the Supper, those who first partook of it must have done so unbaptized, by asserting the identity of John's Baptism with that of the Apostles subsequent to the giving of the great commission; but the difference between the two is so manifest that the assumption is totally untenable. The Apostles baptized "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,"—John did not. The Apostles required the expression of a belief that Jesus was the Messiah,—John did not himself know Jesus until he saw the Spirit descending upon him at the moment of his baptism. The fact that the disciples of John came to Jesus to enquire if he were the long-expected one that was to come, is of itself proof that John did not baptize in the name of Christ. Moreover, the Apostles required evidence of the renewal of the heart in the case of those whom they baptized, while John could have made no such requirement; or if he did, must have been miserably deceived in his converts, since their goodness was "like the morning cloud, and as the early dew it passed away," as is seen by their rejection of Jesus so soon afterwards.

And lastly, John preached, saying, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven"—the Christian dispensation—"*is at hand.*" How, then, could he have administered Christian baptism before the dispensation to which it belonged had been ushered in? We arrive, therefore, at our previous conclusions, viz., that Christian baptism not having been instituted till after the death of Christ, those who first partook of the Supper from his hands, must have received it unbap-

tized, and hence, that baptism was never intended to be an essential pre-requisite to communion,—especially when the enforcement of such a rule excludes from fellowship those who are regarded, and treated in every other respect, as humble and conscientious believers.

No amount of proof in favour of immersion, if it were to be had, could ever weaken this conclusion, since it stands upon ground entirely its own,—the oneness of all true Christians. However much our Baptist brethren may wish to unite them, the question of communion is totally distinct from that of baptism, and as such they are bound to meet it.

I have thus endeavoured to present to view the more important objections which were urged in reply to these lectures. How far I have been successful in meeting them must be left to others to decide; but one thing I must be permitted to say, and that is, that in no case have I allowed myself to employ an argument which has not all the weight with myself, which I have endeavored to give it with others.

And if the discussion which now terminates, so far at least as I am concerned, shall be found to have contributed in any measure to the elucidation of the truth in relation to it, I shall feel myself to have been both highly honored, and amply repaid for any amount of labour it may have cost me.

MACLEAR, THOMAS & CO., PRINTERS, KING STREET, TORONTO.